

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 3882. A bill granting an increase of pension to James L. Huston; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 3883. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pinna; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3884. A bill for the relief of Domenico Grillo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROGERS of New York:

H. R. 3885. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Antonios Apostolis Malles; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 3886. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Apostolos Vasilis Perkas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXI, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1105. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of J. A. Paugh and 307 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1106. Also, petition of Charles Ward and 810 other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any prohibition legislation by the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1107. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city council, city of Portland, Oreg., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enlargement of the veterans' hospital and facilities at Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

1108. Also, petition of the board of directors of the Pawhuska Chamber of Commerce, Pawhuska, Okla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to cooperative associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1109. Also, petition of the Kern County Chamber of Commerce, Bakersfield, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an independent foreign policy, a Kern River Valley Authority, a Kern River University, and Kilowatt College, and the scrapping of the charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

SATURDAY, JULY 21, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, July 9, 1945)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. C. E. Hawthorne, D. D., minister, Wallace Memorial United Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we lift our hearts in praise to Thee. Thou art our God and the God of our Nation. History tells its continuing story of the matchless grace and mercy of God, extended to us from the beginning of our Nation until now. Thou hast guided, kept, and strengthened us. Thou art worthy to be praised, and we render to Thee our hearts' devotion.

On this new day we pray Thy blessing upon the President of the United States. Give him and those that counsel with him wisdom and strength, and may the

directing hand of God be felt in every decision that is made. With gratitude to Thee for the success of our arms, we commit the welfare of our forces to Thee this day. Give strength and protection and dea. in mercy, we pray. Guide now this body in all its deliberations. May the wisdom of the Lord be given to each Member. And in all that we do, may Thy name be glorified. We ask this in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, July 20, 1945 was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Andrews	Hart	Murdoch
Austin	Hatch	O'Daniel
Ball	Hawkes	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hayden	Radcliffe
Billbo	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brewster	Hill	Robertson
Briggs	Hoey	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Smith
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taft
Butler	La Follette	Taylor
Capehart	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tunnell
Cordon	McClellan	Vandenberg
Donnell	McFarland	Wagner
Downey	McKellar	Walsh
Eastland	Magnuson	Wheeler
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	Mead	White
Fulbright	Millikin	Young
George	Mitchell	
Green	Moore	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is absent on important business at the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### DEDUCTION IN COMPUTING TAXES OF EXPENSES OF INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 50), which reads as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That in the public interest the Congress hereby declares that by the re-enactment, in the various revenue acts beginning with the Revenue Act of 1918, of the provisions of section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code and of the corresponding sections of prior revenue acts allowing a deduction for ordinary and necessary business expenses, and by the enactment of the provisions of section 711 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the deduction for intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells, the Congress has recognized and approved the provisions of section 29.23 (m)-16 of Treasury Regulations 111 and the corresponding provisions of prior Treasury regulations granting the option to deduct as expenses such intangible drilling and development costs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 50, upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered, and upon which, under the agreement of yesterday, no further debate is in order. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BUTLER. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], who, if present, would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer that pair to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], who, if present, would vote "yea." Being at liberty to vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is unavoidably absent. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

I further announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is detained by illness.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on business in Government departments pertaining to their respective States.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is absent on important business at the Veterans' Administration.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr.

OVERTON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. The transfer of that pair has been announced heretofore.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the transfer of which has been announced heretofore.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 16, as follows:

## YEAS—51

Andrews	Hawkes	Mitchell
Ball	Hayden	Moore
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bilbo	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Radeliffe
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Kilgore	Robertson
Capehart	Langer	Shipstead
Capper	Lucas	Taylor
Chavez	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McFarland	Tunnell
Ellender	McKellar	Wagner
Fulbright	Magnuson	Walsh
George	Maybank	Wheeler
Gurney	Mead	Wherry
Hatch	Millikin	Young

## NAYS—16

Alken	Ferguson	Smith
Austin	Green	Taft
Brewster	Hart	Vandenberg
Burton	La Follette	White
Cordon	Morse	
Donnell	Murdock	

## NOT VOTING—28

Bailey	Guffey	Saltonstall
Bankhead	Hill	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	McMahon	Tobey
Butler	Murray	Tydings
Byrd	Myers	Wiley
Chandler	Overton	Willis
Connally	Pepper	Wilson
Gerry	Reed	
Glass	Russell	

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement about the vote taken a short time ago on House Concurrent Resolution No. 50. This morning, during my temporary absence from the Senate, the Senate voted on the resolution, which had been reported to the Senate by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], from the Committee on Finance. I was detained at that time on important public business. If I had been present I would have supported adoption of the concurrent resolution. The independent oil operators were very much interested in it, and I am delighted that the concurrent resolution has been agreed to.

Mr. MOORE subsequently said: Mr. President, on Thursday and Friday of this week we have had considerable discussion of House Concurrent Resolution 50, which was designed to clarify a tax situation existing in the oil-producing industry. Lest it appear to some of the Members of the Senate who are considerably removed geographically from the oil-producing industry that this was a matter which could be delayed without public injury, I ask consent to place in the Record a memorandum which I received on June 22 from J. C. Hunter and Russell B. Brown, who are cochairmen of the petroleum committee representing 43 oil and gas associations.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## MEMORANDUM ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 50

We invite your careful consideration and approval of House Concurrent Resolution 50. This resolution was approved by the Ways and Means Committee of the House by unanimous vote and passed the House on the consent calendar. The resolution has been favorably recommended by the Senate Finance Committee and will, no doubt, be before the Senate for early consideration.

The purpose of the resolution is to remove any doubt as to the validity of Treasury regulations giving to the taxpayer the option to either capitalize or charge to expense intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells. These regulations have been in effect for more than 28 years and the Congress has continued in successive revenue acts adopted since that time the basic statutory provisions from which such regulations are derived.

The Congress in passing the Internal Revenue laws provided for such Treasury regulations. The basic statute from which these regulations are derived read as follows: "All ordinary and necessary expenditures paid or incurred in carrying on a trade or business may be deducted from gross income of the year in which such expenditures are incurred." (Sec. 23 (a), Internal Revenue Code.)

The validity of the regulations of the Treasury Department on this subject has been questioned in recent court action and uncertainty occasioned by doubts as to their validity is materially interfering with the exploration for and the production of oil. The Treasury Department and the Bureau of Internal Revenue have announced that they will continue to recognize the regulations under which they now operate unless otherwise directed by Congress.

The Ways and Means Committee in their report on this bill, Report No. 761, stated:

"For these reasons your committee deems it necessary to have Congress reaffirm its position that such regulations are in accordance with and have the full force and effect of law."

Emphasizing the importance of the necessity for emergency consideration, we call attention to a statement by Deputy Petroleum Administrator Ralph K. Davies with regard to petroleum production in his press release dated June 5, 1945, from which we quote the following:

"More than 400,000 barrels of the current daily crude-oil production in the United States come from fields and pools discovered since Pearl Harbor. Deputy Petroleum Administrator Ralph K. Davies said today in emphasizing the necessity of maintaining the exploration program of the industry at the highest possible level in order to meet military and essential civilian requirements. . . .

"Despite the termination of the European war, military and essential civilian require-

ments for petroleum products will remain at a level that will necessitate operation of the Nation's oilfields at or above their maximum efficient rate of production, the Deputy Administrator said.

"Consequently, the search for new fields and pools must be pressed at the maximum level consistent with available materials and manpower in order to offset the tremendous drain of the Nation's known crude-oil reserves, he explained.

"The drilling program for 1945 calls for completion of 27,000 development and exploration wells. Of this total, PAW has asked for the drilling of 5,000 wildcat wells. Mr. Davies said it would be desirable to increase this program as rapidly as materials and manpower become available."

The point of view of the armed forces with relation to petroleum supplies was stated by Capt. W. G. Greenman, United States Navy, Director of Naval Petroleum Reserves, in his statement to the Special Senate Committee Investigating Petroleum Resources on June 21, 1945, in the following language:

"The armed services are absolutely dependent upon petroleum products for fuel and lubricants to carry out their several missions in defense of the Nation. Substitutes and synthetics are not now sufficiently developed nor are they likely to be produced within a reasonable time in sufficient quantities to permit reliance upon them. Therefore, until a reliable substitute is available, the national security demands an assured reserve supply of petroleum both above and below the ground within the continental limits of the country ample for the needs of the armed services and for the industrial requirements of the Nation in time of war. A commodity so absolutely vital to the very life of the Nation ought not to be entirely dependent upon foreign supply and water-borne transportation."

The War Production Board on June 16, 1945, released for publication a list of 101 items and groups of items that are now or are expected to be in short supply which was submitted to the War Production Board in the first report of the newly appointed Joint Committee for Critical Material and Products. These are the items, the committee reported, that might bottleneck war-supporting programs or civilian programs of high urgency. Among these items is crude oil.

We sincerely hope that this important question may have your favorable consideration.

Mr. MOORE. To bring the situation down to the present, I also ask consent to place in the Record the following excerpt from the Oilgram, a representative trade publication, of July 17 date. Among the deterrents to the drilling which is now so greatly needed, according to this statement, is the uncertainty on tax matters arising from the court decision which gave rise to House Concurrent Resolution 50.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## HEAVY CRUDE PRODUCTION INDEFINITELY REQUIRED

WASHINGTON.—Producers heard from PAW today that crude production will have to be maintained indefinitely at a rate some 200,000 barrels daily in excess of maximum efficient capacity to meet refinery runs required for manufacture of the minimum essential quantities of war-supporting products.

The statement, made to the PIWC production committee by PAW Production Director J. R. McWilliams, was predicated on the



assumption of the Japanese war continuing through 1946. Mr. McWilliams added a belief, however, that production at this rate "can be attained without greatly endangering the sustained productive capacity of the Nation's oil fields through the probable remaining period of the war."

At the same time taking note of rumors of a sudden recent decrease in the demand for drilling rigs, he warned that total United States efficient productive capacity can be maintained only if the 27,000 new wells programmed for 1945 and the 30,000 wells which will probably be needed during 1946 are drilled.

"Failure to accomplish any portion of the projected drilling program will result," he said, "in a corresponding reduction in productive capacity. It is urgent, therefore, that every effort be made to attain the well completion rate programmed for this year."

PAW. Mr. McWilliams said, has investigated these rumors of a decrease in demand for rigs and found that the more important indicated reasons for the decrease are (1) increased delivery of new equipment so that a large number of new rigs have been placed in operation; (2) the absence of appropriate incentive because of controlled crude oil prices; (3) uncertainty surrounding the tax problems arising out of the FHE case decision by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, and (4) a substantial decrease in available development well locations under the current well-spacing restrictions.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 1270) relating to the payment of subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3633) to facilitate reconversion, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3314) to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 3644) to amend the veterans regulations to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disabilities in excess of total disability, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 110 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

##### JURISDICTION OVER OFFENSES COMMITTED BY OR AGAINST CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed

legislation to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Devils Lake Indian Reservation (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

##### REPORTS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of April 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Chairman and Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the period from its organization on February 2, 1932, to March 31, 1945, inclusive (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

##### PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the officer in charge, the American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of personnel requirements for that Commission for the quarter ending September 30, 1945; (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

##### SESSION LAWS OF THE TERRITORY OF ALASKA

A letter from the Secretary of Alaska, transmitting pursuant to law, certified copies of the 1945 Session Laws of the Territory of Alaska, including memorials and resolutions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

##### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., favoring an increase in the facilities and staff of the Veterans' Administration at Portland, Oreg.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

##### "House Joint Resolution 38"

"Whereas Franklin Delano Roosevelt served his country with patience, perseverance, fortitude, and courage in time of peace and in time of war; and

"Whereas he successfully guided this country out of the most serious depression which it has ever known; and

"Whereas he furnished this country and its allied nations with superb leadership during the most disastrous strife of the world; and

"Whereas, through his trust in humanity, Franklin Delano Roosevelt inspired others to believe in their fellowmen; and

"Whereas he fought valiantly for his ideals of world peace and security and inspired others to desire a world society built upon the 'four freedoms': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Alabama (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States is memorialized hereby to dedicate January 30, the birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as a national holiday, to be so proclaimed each year by the President of the United States, symbolizing the appreciation and respect which the people of this country have for a gallant leader of noble character; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Alabama is directed hereby to transmit copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate of the Congress of the United States and the Members of Congress from the State of Alabama."

##### REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 518) to provide for the issuance of permits for the use of live decoys in the taking of ducks, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 506) thereon.

##### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1289. A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission;

S. 1290 (by request). A bill to amend the Transportation of Explosives Act, as amended; and

S. 1291 (by request). A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1292. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of war veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

##### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3644) to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide additional rates of compensation or pension and remedy inequalities as to specific service-incurred disabilities in excess of total disability, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

##### PROPOSED JOINT COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution which would create a joint committee on Federal-State relations.

This committee would be charged with the investigation of the present interrelationships between the powers and the activities of Federal, State, and local governments.

It would make recommendations for the restoration and maintenance of the proper distribution of authority and functions among those governments, as provided under the United States Constitution. The joint committee would seek to encourage harmony, efficiency, economy, and cooperation in the interrelated work of Federal, State, and local governments.

I would not submit this concurrent resolution to create still another congressional committee did not the situation urgently demand it.

The battle between the proponents of centralization and the advocates of local self-government will rage fiercely in the coming months and years. The battle between local democracy at the crossroads and Federal bureaucracy in Washington, D. C., will be intense and unremitting. The Federal bureaucrats will not give up their ill-gotten gains of power without a fight. They will not voluntarily surrender the functions which they kidnaped from the States and localities under the cloak of the depression and the war emergencies.

For years we have looked with dismay not only upon the kidnaping of States' rights by the Federal Government, but upon the insidious Federal undermining of the will to local self-rule.

Now we can do something to halt and reverse this process by agreeing to this concurrent resolution.

But there are other compelling reasons for this joint committee.

The most casual observer can detect the scrambled chaotic mess of overlapping and conflicting Federal, State, and local statutes on such a matter as taxes. This committee could help straighten out the tax mess.

The most casual student can see that the Federal and State Governments must get together on such matters as aviation laws. This committee could help insure such cooperation.

Everyone can see that there is a vast twilight area between the powers and the functions of the State and Federal Governments. This committee could help clear up that twilight area.

Right now the joint committee, if it were established, could scrutinize the national airport program. This committee could point out that this program, if enacted, would short-circuit and circumvent State governments to a certain extent.

Right now this joint committee, if established, could be working for the immediate return of State employment services to the States.

If this joint committee were established now, it could be working to restore other powers to our States and localities, for the States and localities can stand on their own feet today and reassume all the powers that were taken from them.

Our States today are in a better financial condition than they have been for perhaps the last 100 years. They are perhaps in a far better condition than any of the other levels of government. Almost all of the States have substantial surpluses largely invested in war bonds. A considerable part of these surpluses are earmarked for postwar public works. The States need a green light to go ahead. The establishment of this joint committee would flash that green light.

It would flash a green light, too, to the localities, to business, and the rest of our population. It would show them that America's march on the road to serfdom has come to a dead stop and is being reversed.

But do not mistake the purpose of this committee as being to force a return to the past. The past is dead. The purpose of this committee would be to review existing legislation on the statute books, to review pending legislation, and to formulate its own plans and legislation whereby the immortal concepts of checks and balances in the American Constitution could be dynamically interpreted and implemented for the needs of today and tomorrow.

Woodrow Wilson once said:

The question of the relation of the States to the Federal Government is the cardinal question of our constitutional system. It cannot be settled by the opinion of any one generation because it is a question of growth, and every successive stage of our political

and economic development gives it a new aspect, makes it a new question.

I ask, then, Is not a joint committee on Federal-State relations, dedicated to so momentous a question, desirable now and in the years to come?

In these last significant days—and how significant they have been—and in what will take place next week—and how significant that will be—America will have cut her moorings from the past, not simply politically but economically, agriculturally, on the sea, and in the air. This National Government of ours, by the acts of this very Congress, has decided, in fact and in deed, to act its part on the world stage. We are now the leading Nation on earth. Whether we like it or not, after we adopt the San Francisco Charter next week, the moorings of the past will have been cut. I say in all sincerity to the Members of the Senate, is not this an added reason why we should reinstate the relationship between the States and the Government contemplated by the founding fathers when they formed the Constitution, getting rid of Government controls over the States—controls which came into existence by virtue of the depression and the war—and demobilizing the army of Government bureaucrats—all America wants that done—which will weaken our internal stability if we do not do so? This is particularly true now that we have embarked on this foreign adventure.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the outstanding reason for the adoption of the resolution which would result in having the joint committee begin to operate is that the Federal Government now is reaching out into the States, as it did in the past, taking away from them functions which under the Constitution belong to the States. By virtue of legislation passed by Congress, the Federal Government is reaching out into the whole world. It has plenty to do in the international picture without taking over the functions which, under the Constitution, belong to local government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in full in the RECORD following my remarks, and that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Federal-State Relations (hereinafter referred to as the committee) to be composed of 5 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and 5 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the function of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee shall make a full and complete study and investigation of the present interrelationships between the powers and work of Federal, State, and local governments, with a view to making recom-

mendations for the restoration and the maintenance of the proper distribution of authority and functions among those governments as provided under the Constitution of the United States, and with a view to making recommendations for the encouragement of harmony, efficiency, economy, and cooperation in the interrelated work of Federal, State, and local governments.

SEC. 3. (a) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-ninth Congress, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

(d) The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date the results of its study, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEECH IN BERLIN

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a few moments ago I happened to pick up today's issue of the Washington Daily News and read therein an editorial on the subject of President Truman's extemporaneous speech in Berlin. In a moment I shall ask that the editorial be read from the desk.

In particular, I wish to call attention to one thing which the President said in Berlin in his extemporaneous speech. I have been asked about it. Other Senators have been asked about it. Did he mean that we should not have bases in the Pacific? I think the President's language was very clear when he said:

There is not one piece of territory or one thing of a monetary nature that we want out of this war.

I believe that the President, in using those words, expressed the voice of the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be read from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the editorial will be read. The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### AMERICA SPEAKS

President Truman's extemporaneous speech in Berlin was a model. It was equal to the occasion.

This was not just another flag-raising. This was the same precious cloth that flew over the Capitol in Washington the day we went to war. Eisenhower raised it over Algiers when he won the north African campaign. It announced to Rome the liberation of the Holy City. Now it flies over Berlin's ruins, proof that democracy is stronger than aggressors. And this same Old Glory next will wave over a defeated Tokyo.

We commend to politicians the President's literary style. It has the virtues usually



lacking in those who orate. Simplicity, clarity, conviction—and brevity. His whole address took 2 minutes. It had only 219 words, few longer than two syllables.

But those words carried great meaning. They were a proud declaration of American victory, a confident assertion of American strength, and a pledge to use America's superior power for world prosperity and peace: "We have conclusively proved that a free people can successfully look after the affairs of the world.

"This flag we are raising \* \* \* in the name of the people of the United States who are looking forward to a better world, a world in which all the people will have an opportunity to enjoy the good things in life—and not just a few at the top.

"There is not one piece of territory or one thing of a monetary nature that we want out of this war. We want peace and prosperity for the world as a whole.

"If we can put this tremendous machine of ours, which has made this victory possible, to work for peace we could look forward to the greatest age in the history of mankind. That is what we propose to do."

The President has been called "just an ordinary American." Of course, he is no average man. But what he said yesterday at the flag ceremony in Berlin does express the pride and the will and the hope of plain Americans.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS ON RAISING AMERICAN FLAG OVER GROUP-CONTROL HEADQUARTERS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following the remarks of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] earlier in the day when he inserted in the RECORD an editorial referring to the address made by President Truman in Berlin on July 20, the address delivered by the President at the time of the raising of the American flag over the group control headquarters.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

General Eisenhower, officers and men, this is a historic occasion. We have conclusively proven that free people can successfully look after the affairs of the world.

We are here today to raise the flag of victory over the capital of our greatest adversary. In doing that we must remember that in raising that flag we are raising it in the name of the people of the United States who are looking forward to a better world, a peaceful world, a world in which all people will have the opportunity to enjoy the good things of life, and not just a few at the top.

Let us not forget that we are fighting for peace and for the welfare of mankind. We are not fighting for conquest. There is not one piece of territory or one thing of a monetary nature that we want out of this war.

We want peace and prosperity for the world as a whole. We want to see the time come when we can do the things in peace that we have been able to do in war.

If we can put this tremendous machine of ours, which has made victory possible, to work for peace, we can look forward to the greatest age in the history of mankind. That is what we propose to do.

#### TIDEWATER OIL LANDS—LETTERS FROM SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD letters dated June 25, 1945, and July 16, 1945, from Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, to Mr. Robert W. Kenney, attorney general

of California, on the subject of tidewater oil lands, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### WARTIME SERVICE AND TREATMENT OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS—REPORT OF AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMISSION

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of a report entitled "The Experience of the American Friends Service in Civilian Public Service," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### RESIGNATION OF GENERAL CHENNAULT—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials from New Orleans newspapers commenting on the resignation of General Chennault, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### LOAN TO ELLIOTT ROOSEVELT BY JOHN HARTFORD—EDITORIAL FROM SATURDAY EVENING POST

[Mr. WHERRY (for Mr. CAPEHART) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Elliott's Loans Belong in New Deal History," published in the Saturday Evening Post of July 21, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 145), providing for membership of the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment.

#### REDEPLOYMENT AND TRANSPORTATION OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, recently there has been considerable controversy over the redeployment of the Army, primarily from the European theater of operations. Some confusing statements have been issued and some misinformation has been disseminated, the result being that members of families of men now in the armed services have written to me numerous letters requesting that I give to them the true and correct information on this problem. In attempting to ascertain the facts, Mr. President, I have turned to Mr. John J. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, a man whom I personally know. I turned to him with the full realization that I would get from him the facts without color or distortion. I also talked with the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Robert P. Patterson about the number of men who are returning from the European and Pacific theaters, and I will have something to say about that in the course of my remarks. I have also talked informally with Col. J. M. Johnson, director of ODT, and have received a copy of a letter which he directed to Fred Vinson, which I shall include in my remarks.

My conversation with Mr. Pelley resulted in a request from me that he give to me in writing the story, as he understands it, insofar as the railroads of America are concerned. I am going to read and interpose some of my own comment upon this letter, Mr. President, because it is an exceedingly interesting letter, and it brings the facts up to date

upon a question which is creating some controversy throughout the country. The letter is as follows:

JULY 20, 1945.

The Honorable SCOTT LUCAS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LUCAS: The facts as to the movement of servicemen by rail, about which you asked me yesterday afternoon, are briefly outlined below:

The outstanding fact is that the redeployment of the Army is being accomplished promptly, and even ahead of schedule. The armed forces are doing a great job in getting the soldiers home from Europe more rapidly than anyone could have hoped for.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss that point. Apparently there has been criticism by some individuals in this country of the fact that the Army has not kept the railroads up to date with respect to the schedule of men returning from overseas. From some quarters there has been apparent criticism of the Army because the Army has been bringing more men from the European theater than the Army originally scheduled.

Mr. President, if I were directing the affairs of the Army in the office of the Secretary of war, there is nothing I would like better than to be found guilty and convicted of bringing back the men from Europe quicker than was originally planned. I can think of no greater compliment to the Army, irrespective of what the Army planned in the past, than getting American soldiers out of Europe as fast as possible. There may be some delay and some confusion in this country as a result of bringing the soldiers home from Europe with more speed than the Army originally planned. I think it goes without saying that a man serving his country would rather spend some extra time in camp in America than spend it in Europe. Members of our armed forces are now being returned at the rate of 4,000 every day, including Sunday, and the War Department advises me that they will soon step up that rate. The Army is now running ahead of schedule in returning the boys to the United States. Since May 12 of this year approximately 300,000 men have been discharged by the Army, and those 300,000 men who have been returned to America are now in civilian clothes, 200,000 of them having been discharged through the point system and 100,000 having been discharged because of age, physical causes, or for some other reason.

Mr. President, I wish to digress a moment at this point to recall a bit of history of the last political campaign. I think every Senator will recall the statement made by Governor Dewey, the 1944 Republican candidate for President, in one of his early speeches, wherein he charged that the Army, the administration especially, were, after the war was over, deliberately going to hold men in Europe in the Army in order to keep them from coming home and going on relief. It was one of the most unusual statements I ever heard made by a candidate running for the highest office within the gift of the people. I never believed that a man running for that office would trade upon the hopes and the yearnings of the American wives and mothers and sweethearts of these

men in order to gain a few votes. But it was done.

I mention it now so that the record may show that it is answered and proved false as demonstrated by what the Army and the administration are now doing in bringing these boys back to America ahead of schedule. Mr. President, I think it is a remarkable tribute to the Army.

The other day I read in the press an article stating that the Mead committee is investigating this situation. I called for a copy of the release that went to the press, and I find this statement issued by the distinguished Senator from New York:

The committee's investigations to date reveal that there was little long-range planning with respect to redeployment, particularly the redeployment of troops. Government agencies vitally interested in the entire question were generally not consulted and were frequently even in ignorance of some of the plans made by the Army.

Adequate planning and careful coordination by all of the Government agencies involved would have helped to cushion the shock of the job which the railroads must now perform.

Mr. President, I challenge that statement which has been made. Senators will find when they listen to John Pelley's letter that the railroads could not cushion the shock regardless of how much planning was done.

I again compliment the Army for bringing these boys back, regardless of any previous plan or schedule, and returning them to this country as fast as available transportation facilities can transport them.

I wish to make another comment while I am discussing the statement issued by the Mead committee. I do not know what is customary in the Mead committee with respect to issuing statements of this kind in advance of open public hearings. It may be the custom. If I were on the committee I would fight that custom. If executive sessions are to be held, and the press and Senators and other individuals are not allowed to be present and listen, and thereafter public statements are to be issued condemning and criticizing an agency of Government without allowing it an opportunity for a hearing, I submit, with all the sincerity I possess, that such procedure is wrong. This statement went to the country, and the headlines in the newspapers indicate that the Army is getting the blame, and criticism for the confusion, if any, which exists.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much the very forceful argument being made by the senior Senator from Illinois. I commend him for the statement relative to getting the troops home as fast as possible. All of us want that done.

Mr. President, very seldom do I rise in defense of a candidate. A candidate's record is the candidate's best defense. I think that a past political campaign is water over the dam. However, I suggest to the distinguished Senator, because I know he wants to be fair, that the statement which he attributed to the Republican nominee, Tom Dewey,

was a quotation he made from the statement which General Hershey made at that time. General Hershey was a direct representative of the President. I am not in any way criticizing the Senator's statement, but I should like to keep the record straight. If I correctly recall the incident, Tom Dewey was quoting what General Hershey said. If I am correct, I should like the distinguished Senator from Illinois to correct the record. If not, I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator finished?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. Tom Dewey was quoting a statement made by General Hershey, the Selective Service Director, who apparently did not know any more about the demobilization program which had been approved by the Congress of the United States than did one of the Senate pages. I do not care to rehash the political campaign of 1944, but if the Senator wishes to go into it, I shall join issue with him. The point I am making is that, instead of Dewey going to General Marshall and others whom he praised in his Chicago speech as doing a superb job, he took his information from a subordinate who knew nothing about the demobilization program.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me suggest to the Senator that General Hershey was the direct representative of the President of the United States. He was the one who made the statement. Whether the statement was correct or incorrect, he was the one who issued it, and he was responsible.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator can have it that way; and if he wishes to defend Mr. Dewey at this late hour, it is perfectly all right with me. It was one of the things which helped defeat him in the campaign. He appealed to the yearnings and hopes of mothers and wives in order to get a few votes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not intend to enter into a discussion of the political aspects, but I am concerned about the second phase. I am concerned about the Mead committee. I will not even undertake to defend its chairman or its procedure. However, I wish to express my regret that the Senator has found it necessary to raise this issue today, when several members of the Mead committee, including myself, are giving our best efforts to deferring a contemplated public hearing on this matter on Monday, at the suggestion both of the Army authorities interested and of Colonel Johnson, of the Office of Defense Transportation, in the anticipation that such action would serve the public interest. I can see no other conclusion of the issue which the Senator is now raising than to go forward with the hearing, which I personally very much regret. I say this in justice to General Franklin, of the Army, with whom I have discussed the question, and Colonel Johnson, of the ODT. Whether the Senator was informed of that situation I do not know; but it is certainly most regrettable.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret that the Senator from Maine takes that position. I thought that a Senator had the right to speak upon any subject he might choose to discuss. I cannot keep up with the investigations which the committee is making in every conceivable field, which is perfectly proper under the resolution creating the committee.

I learned for the first time this morning from the attorney, when I asked for a copy of the release, that three executive sessions had been held, and that a public hearing was contemplated on Monday. I did not realize that in making this statement I was trespassing upon the rights of the Mead committee; and I am very sorry that the Senator from Maine thinks it is regrettable for me to discuss here a question which is of such vital interest to the American public. I know that whatever I may say will not deter the famous Mead committee from going ahead and making its investigation. The Mead committee has done a good job and will continue to do a good job. However, I have this letter of explanation from Mr. Pelley and obviously I shall proceed to read it into the Record.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I quite agree with the Senator. I hope that nothing in my remarks indicated any questioning of the complete propriety of the Senator's procedure.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator said that it was regrettable that I was making a statement on the floor of the Senate with respect to this situation, in view of the fact that the Mead committee was to handle the subject on Monday in an open hearing.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was not what I said. I said it was regrettable in view of the fact that several members of the Mead committee were moving heaven and earth to try to stop a public hearing on Monday, with the idea that the public interest would be better served. That was what I said. They are doing so at the suggestion both of the Army and the ODT. That is why I regretted that this had happened. I did not in any way question the Senator's motives, or the propriety of his statement.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of that statement, I believe that there should be an open hearing, and that the Army should have an opportunity to make reply, in view of the unfavorable publicity emanating from the Mead committee which has been spread all over the country. Such is certainly not in accordance with the best interests of the Army.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think there is no other course.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. MEAD. Personally, I have no objection to the discussion of this matter on the floor of the Senate at this time. However, let me say in behalf of the committee of which I happen to be chair-



man that some weeks ago, realizing that it was our duty under the circumstances to make inquiry into the transportation problem, the committee called the head of the ODT, Colonel Johnson. Among other things, Colonel Johnson told us that unless additional personnel were found for the railroads, it would be most difficult for them to carry out this huge undertaking. He also stated that on one occasion the Army brought into the country 100,000 men more than he had been told to provide for. On another occasion—

Mr. LUCAS. I wish, so far as I am concerned, they could bring in a million more than they prepared for.

Mr. MEAD. That is why we felt that there should be some coordination, because returning the men to this country is one thing, but providing transportation so that they can go home is quite another thing.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; and we have not the transportation. That is the point I wish to read from Mr. Pelley's letter. I would rather have the million men in camps in this country, regardless of what the previous arrangements were. If I had been serving in the Army in Europe for 2 years, I would want to get back to America, and into a camp in this country.

Mr. MEAD. But we cannot get the men to camps in this country unless railroad service is available at the docks to take them to the camps. Colonel Johnson said he had the right to know about the plans of the Army. The Secretary of the Navy told us that he was not informed about the Army operations, but that he thought it was some of his business.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree that there should be full cooperation, but if I were being returned from Europe after serving in the Army for 2½ years, and landed at New York and was told to go to a camp, I would get there. I would not care whether railroad transportation was available or not. I would get to that camp. And, remember, New York is not the only available port for the deployment of these men.

Mr. MEAD. It would be much better if the Army, the ODT, and the Navy could get together so as to do a more efficient job. That is why we brought this question to the situation it now occupies. It is a matter for hearing before our committee. We hope to aid in bringing the agencies of the Government together so that they will solve the problem in a more effective way.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say that I noticed the release from the Mead committee. I thought the Interstate Commerce Committee was the committee which handled transportation matters, but I find that certain of the special committees of the Senate are taking up transportation as well as other matters.

I wish to say that before the Mead committee took it up, it came to my attention. I called Colonel Johnson, of the ODT, and had him at my office. I talked to him about this transportation problem. He told me the trouble was that the transportation which was

needed was not available. He said they were doing everything humanly possible, but that the men were being brought from Europe much faster than they could be handled by the transportation facilities out of New York or some of the other ports.

I agree entirely with what the Senator said. After visiting various camps in Europe, I did not find a soldier over there who did not want to get back to the United States as quickly as possible. All of them said, "Get us back to the United States." That was the first thing they said to me.

For instance, we visited a camp where there were 43,000 American troops who had been released from German prisons. They were complaining because they could not get back home. They felt they were the forgotten men. We flew to that camp with General Eisenhower. I wish to compliment him because of the way he handled the situation. He said to them, "I am going to get you back in boats or in airplanes; I am going to get you back just as fast as possible. Even if you have to stand up on the boat, I am going to get you back home." He made a personal inspection, because someone in the United States had written an article saying that the troops were not being properly taken care of and were not getting back as rapidly as possible.

We must look at the matter from the standpoint of the Army. Every soldier over there wants to get home. The Army is being criticized because it is not getting them back home soon enough. That is having a demoralizing effect.

I agree entirely that if I had been in a German prison camp or if I had been in the front lines for 2 years, I would want to get home—to New York or to some other United States port—as quickly as I could, even if I had to stand up in a railroad car after I got here.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for his statement. I think he is correct in what he says.

I, too, have talked informally to Colonel Johnson about this matter. I know the colonel's position. Perhaps there has not been a complete exchange of information among all departments concerned, but it is not of such importance, in my opinion, to be making a national issue out of it. I say that just so long as the Army keeps bringing our troops back from Europe—and there are 2,000,000 of them to be discharged—that is going to be all right with the Senator from Illinois. I know there are some difficulties and some transportation problems, but in a moment I shall read John Pelley's letter which will explain the whole thing.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I wish to say for the information of the Senator from Illinois that I talked to Colonel Johnson a few minutes ago on the very question which is now under discussion. At that time he said that the executive hearings previously held had resulted in his obtaining the information he needed to have in order to make proper plans, and at that time he asked that nothing further be

done until he had an opportunity to work out the plans. I think that is what the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was referring to, namely, the request of the ODT regarding this matter.

I also wish to say that while I agree it is best to get the troops back home quickly, at the same time there would be one of the worst complaints in the world if 4,000 men a day were turned loose on the streets of New York, to get home as best they could.

I think this matter must be synchronized. The loophole or the principal difficulty seems to be that the information was not being furnished to the ODT, and thus the transportation plans could not be made.

I think that is what Colonel Johnson wants; I think he has obtained the information now. All he asked this morning was to have a little peace and quiet until he could put the plans into effect. I merely wished to make that statement.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the trouble is that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Mead committee have seen fit to give press releases to the country. That is what has caused the disturbance. One certainly can conclude from that release that men should not be brought back more quickly because of some chaos and confusion. Would the Senator rather have the original schedule maintained, and not bring back the men from Europe any more rapidly than they have been brought?

Mr. KILGORE. No; and neither would Colonel Johnson.

Mr. LUCAS. Then what is all the shooting about?

Mr. KILGORE. That is what I should like to know.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I am much interested in this discussion. I am wondering whether I have been doing anything wrong when I have been urging that captured German ships be put to the task of bringing back American troops. I fully agree with the Senator from Illinois that there is more than one port of debarkation in the United States; and with ample and increased shipping facilities, it is not necessary to land all the troops at one port, to wit, New York, and to send them all over the country from that one congested area.

There are seven German ships in various ports that are now under the control of the British. Approximately 35,000 men a month could be brought back by them, in addition to the men who can be moved by our own ships. Those captured German ships are seaworthy; I am advised that is true by men with long shipping experience. They can sail out of port under their own steam. They can come into our ports on the east coast, and can be put in first-class condition within from 30 to 90 days. It is true that Great Britain and Russia have an interest in those ships. Their replacement value is estimated to be approximately \$75,000,000. We certainly have an equal interest in the ships. Great Britain and Russia owe us money on lend-lease and for various other causes, and there would seem to me to be no reason on earth why

our authorities do not ask for these ships, which cannot presently be used profitably by Great Britain or Russia, and put them into the service of bringing back our men.

I fully agree that it would be better to bring them back to the United States than to leave them in Germany. Think what it means to those men. We had an Army of more than 3,000,000 men in Europe at the end of the war in that theater. We propose to keep only 400,000 of them there for a permanent army of occupation. We are bringing them back at the rate of approximately 4,000 a day at the moment. About 200,000 a month is the estimated capacity, I believe. On that basis many men who fought through the campaigns in Europe will be there for more than a year before they will embark for the shores of America. That ought not to be tolerated if it lies within our power to bring the men back more speedily.

There may be difficulties and delays between the time the men land from seaplanes and ships and their transportation to their homes by the railroads and other carriers; but it would be better for the men to get out of Europe, because I can think of nothing which would be more discouraging and destructive of the morale of our men and of their families at home than to know that after the battle in that area had been over for more than a year many of them would have to cool their heels in Europe before they could actually set sail for America.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished friend from Georgia, and I agree fully with everything he has said. Every ship we can charter will be none too many.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to express my full approval of everything which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has said concerning the desirability of bringing about a speedy return of our soldiers from Europe.

I invite attention to the fact that France requires that we pay our soldiers in French money. She by law takes our dollar. She claims that under some sort of an agreement, made with somebody over here, somewhere, and that no one seems to know much about it, the monetary exchange is on a basis of 50 French francs to the dollar, but in France itself the rate is much higher, 150 French francs to the dollar, so that our soldiers are deprived of at least two-thirds of their pay. Incidentally, this is gratitude. It is an outrage upon America. America has done a great work for France. She has helped to free her from the control of Germany. It seems to me that we should be able to move our soldiers more rapidly than we have been able to do up to the present time. If it is necessary for the Congress to take action in order that our soldiers may be returned from Europe, where, I repeat, they are being defrauded in the amount of salary they should receive, defrauded under an alleged agreement, then I submit that Congress should take whatever action is necessary in order to correct the situation.

I think the action of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] in bringing this matter before the Senate and the public is very timely. I thank him for doing so.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank my able friend the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was not present during all the remarks of the senior Senator from Illinois on the subject being discussed, but I entirely agree with what I have heard.

It seems to me that there is another phase of the problem which perhaps the Mead committee should look into. It involves a great volume of shipping. The Army and Navy are still engaged in a war in the Pacific and are deploying many of our ships around to the Pacific theater. That procedure, of course, may result in a shortage of shipping in the Atlantic which otherwise could be used in bringing men from Europe back to the United States. I think it is time that the Army and Navy should correlate their shipping requirements with the War Shipping Administration, and arrange for a certain volume of shipping to be used in bringing our men back from Europe. We have so many ships, and so many men. Provision should be made for bringing the men home within a certain length of time. Many of them, of course, are being sent today to the Pacific area. That means that they have only a one-way passage.

Mr. LUCAS. The men who are being brought back to the United States are being moved faster than was called for by the original schedule. That is why I compliment the War Department rather than criticize it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct, but many of the ships which are now being used in bringing men back to this country will not be able to keep up the good work. They will be sent around to the Pacific, and there will be a slow-down in about a month because the ships will be used in taking men to the Pacific theater.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be true, but the War Department thinks it may be possible even to increase its present schedule.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I really believe this discussion will be very helpful. I think we are all in agreement that we want the maximum number of men brought home which it is possible to transport. Our committee is attempting to bring together all the agencies of the Government with the idea of coordinating their effort in order to bring about a maximum transportation of the boys from the European theater to America. That matter extends beyond the province of any one committee of the Senate for the reason that coordination of all transportation agencies is an essential factor. It includes aviation, the merchant marine, the railroads, and other forms of transportation.

If we could arrange—and we have discussed this matter at a meeting of the committee—for the Army Transport Service to deliver men at Atlanta, for example, where the facilities for handling them are quite ample, instead of at Miami, it would take a tremendous strain

off the railroads and would add to the possibility of bringing about a greater deployment of troops. We are discussing the matter with all agencies of the Government which may be concerned. Only the other day we had a hearing with one of the officers of the War Shipping Administration in connection with one of the matters mentioned by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

There is also necessary another coordination, namely, a coordination of the highest possible echelon, a coordination of the United Nations. In one of the harbors of Europe there is located one of the greatest passenger-carrying ships in Europe. It will be necessary to dredge a channel 750 feet long before that ship can reach the sea. In an effort to obtain all the available ships and bring back the maximum number of troops to America, it is necessary to discuss with other agencies of the Government the possibility of placing in service ships which are locked up in some of the harbors of Germany and other countries. We want the maximum number of those ships used in bringing home our troops, and in taking to the Pacific the troops which will have to be transferred to that area.

It is a gigantic task, Mr. President. It will require coordination of all agencies of the Government which may be interested in the matter of transportation. It will require coordination of all the United Nations in order that the maximum number of ships may be put into service.

We are all anxious to bring back our men at the earliest possible time, and I am sure that every effort will be made in coordinating the efforts of the various agencies to the end that our objectives may be achieved.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point I have been making, and that is exactly what the War Department officials are doing. They are today bringing back more men from Europe than they said they would bring back when the original schedule was established. Yet, the Army has been condemned because it has not taken up with other agencies of the Government, particularly with the Mead committee, every detail of the problems involved. Consequently the Army is on the griddle.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not wish to be understood as criticizing the Army.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator did not criticize it. He was complimenting the Army in the statement which he made a moment ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think the Army should be criticized for what it has done. It has done a magnificent work. I think the Senator from Illinois is to be complimented for bringing the subject to the attention of the public, and of this body.

Mr. LUCAS. I am grateful to the Senator. I take the position that we should be able to bring these 2,000,000 men back to America at least as fast as we sent them there. I am informed that in many cases they were sent there faster than they are being brought back. Certainly, we should be able to bring them home in peace, with the same speed, or even greater, than we sent them across the seas to war.



Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the able Senator from Illinois has brought this matter to the floor of the Senate, because I think it is a question which deserves the attention of the Senate. I know of no one claiming that our men and women are being brought back to this country too fast. Having been over where these soldiers are, I know every one of them wants to get back at the earliest possible date, and it is the duty of the Government to see that they do get back at the earliest possible date.

So far as the Mead committee is concerned, it needs no defense. I think in this particular case it did not go into the other committee's work. It merely went into the coordination of the various agencies in the solving of one of the big American problems; that is, transportation of the soldiers from Europe to this country, and then from the ports to their camps or their homes. This question is very vital to our war effort and it is within the committee's jurisdiction.

In the executive hearings we discovered that there was absolutely no coordination so far as the ODT was concerned. It is said by the able Senator from Illinois, based on the letter he read, that the Army is bringing the men back faster than they anticipated would be done. What I want to know is, why did not the Army anticipate that we could bring them back as fast as we are bringing them back, and then why did they not take it up with the ODT and the ones responsible for their transportation so that the ODT, railroads, and air lines would be able to transport the men?

I for one want them transported at once. But we must realize that we must have civilian production to keep the war in the Pacific going. I should like to see the Army bring some of these men home by way of the St. Lawrence River. Some of the boats could come up the St. Lawrence and the men could be shipped by the railroads from Canadian ports into the United States. I should like to see the Army stop the four-engine planes at Presque Isle, in Maine, and then two-engine planes could fly the men to Detroit, to Chicago, to St. Louis or other cities, where there is plenty of transportation, and the men could be moved. There are many airports where these men could be landed. There are many ship ports where they could be landed. The fact is that the Mead committee is going into the lack of coordination upon the part of the Army, and the other agencies, not that the Army is not doing the job of getting the men back, but there is the other job to do the whole job and that takes coordination and that is what the Mead committee has been going into.

Mr. President, I hope that the coming hearing will be public, and if the testimony before the public is as it is anticipated from what it has been in the private hearing, then the people will learn, not that too many men are coming back, no, we want them back faster than they are coming back, but when we get them to these shores, we want coordination with civilian authorities here, the ODT, the Navy, and all the airplane companies

and the railroads so that we can transport the men to their homes. I say that such coordination should even extend to where the men are sent to camps. We find them now going clear to the Pacific coast to their homes, then we find them coming back to the Atlantic coast to camps here, and then we will find them going back again to the Pacific.

Mr. President, we will have to increase transportation on the western roads 25 percent if we are to do the job in the Pacific we have to do. The test will be, can we do it and have the railroads transport other passengers? We will have to give up a great number of freight trains which are going to carry munitions. We need further coordination. We need the doctors brought back. When I was in Germany—

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not desire to yield for an hour's speech. I thought I was yielding for a question, more or less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I will let the Senator conclude.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to say a word about coordination in bringing the doctors home where they are vitally needed. When I was in Germany I saw the coordination of the Army in releasing prisoners, taking them within 5 miles of their homes so that they engage in farming activities. I found they were trying to coordinate so as to get coal miners; they were releasing men from prison camps to enable them to go home and mine coal, and others to work in the transportation field. But we need 25,000 men, we are told, on the railroads in the United States. What has been done to transport from the western front immediately those skilled railroad men who have 85 points or more so that they may go to work on American railroads? What has been done to bring our doctors home, what has been done to bring our coal miners home?

I say that what we need is not only to bring them home but we need coordination among the agencies. The miners could come home, the doctors could come home, and we should get them all home so that they could do the job at home that has to be done. It is not a matter of criticizing the Army for not bringing them back. The criticism is that they are not bringing them back in the correct order, and are not telling the agencies here when they are going to bring them back; there is no coordination.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I feel, as does every other Member of this body, that the soldiers cannot be brought home too quickly. But, in justice to the Army, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I wish to say that I went to practically every country in Europe during the recent months, and words could not express my appreciation for what the Army is doing in bringing the men home. It is an almost impossible task, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said. It is true they are now bringing the men home faster than they originally expected to. General McNarney, in the Italian

theater, will probably have nearly every soldier home from that theater by December, and everything possible is being done. They are coming home faster and more quickly because of the excellent way in which the Army and Navy jointly have handled the problem.

When they started sending the men home, they did not have any docks, they did not have any dock workers who were trained. When we sent the men from New York, we had those facilities. Today prisoners of war and others are assisting in dock labor in order to make possible the loading of the troops.

I merely wish to say, as a member of the committee who happened to see firsthand what was going on, and who had been in Europe in past years and knew about the old docks which used to be there, that the Army and the Navy have done jointly what I would not have believed possible if I had not seen it with my own eyes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, hindsight is so much better than foresight, and I am sure that if the great coordinator, the distinguished Senator from Michigan, had been running the War Department, he would have seen all these obstacles long, long ago, and had them all worked out, so that everyone would have been advised when our troops were to be returned. It is so easy to tear down a house. There is not a Member of the Senate who could not destroy one, but there are very few of them who are capable of constructing a house.

Criticism! Criticism! Simply because one or two officers have been bypassed on some question involving detail, there is criticism throughout the country of this great Army, which has done the most magnificent job in all the history of the world.

I shall continue to read the letter from a man who knows something about the railroads of this country, a man who probably knows more about railroads than any other man in America—and that includes the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. This is what the writer says:

The outstanding fact is that the redeployment of the Army is being accomplished promptly, and even ahead of schedule. The armed forces are doing a great job in getting the soldiers home from Europe more rapidly than anyone could have hoped for. The railroads, using all available equipment, are carrying the men from the ports to their homes with no more than occasional delays incident to so huge a mass transportation task.

The movement of servicemen, which represents the heaviest concentrated domestic transportation load of the entire war, is not being accomplished without criticism and complaint. The conditions which lead to these criticisms and complaints are greatly regretted but they were not unforeseen. Responsible officers of the armed forces and of the railroads have realized that no transportation task of this size could be accomplished so rapidly as this one is being done without some difficulties and discomforts, even if all the resources of the railroads could have been devoted to this one task alone.

During the war, responsible officers of the Government decided that the materials which the railroads asked for to use in building additional passenger cars should be devoted to other and more pressing war purposes.

None of us questioned the decision of those who had the over-all responsibility for the best use of all available materials so as to get the war won, and won as quickly as possible. The war was won in Europe, and the soldiers are coming home. It would be fine to have more cars in which to carry them more comfortably, but permission to build the cars could not be obtained during the war, and the movement is to be made with what is at hand. The main thing is to get on with the job and get it done, and that is being accomplished.

The total passenger travel on the railroads this year will probably be close to five times that of prewar years, but it is to be carried in virtually the same number of coaches and sleeping cars which were then available. This year's load will probably be nearly two and one-half times that of the peak year of the First World War, but it is to be carried with approximately 30 percent fewer passenger-carrying cars than were then available.

Just think of that, Mr. President.

This shrinkage in the number of railroad passenger cars between the First World War and the beginning of the second was due to the fact that in that period so large a part of all travel had come to be made by other means of transportation, and especially by private automobile. Consequently, there were fewer railroad passenger cars because there was less need for them.

In the years just preceding this war, however, the railroads bought a considerable number of new cars—more than 1,500 in the 5 years ending with 1941. At the time of Pearl Harbor the railroads had on order approximately 400 more new passenger cars. With the coming of the war, most of these cars were not completed, nor have the railroads been permitted since that time to build any new passenger cars.

This situation was recognized and dealt with by the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, under the chairmanship of Senator Truman, in its Report No. 10, part 13, dated December 15, 1943. Referring to the limitation which had been put upon the construction of passenger cars since January 1942, and the fact that no additional civilian passenger equipment was then scheduled for production, the committee pointed out that "it is not desirable to attempt to build a large number of new passenger cars at this stage of the war," and added that "the public will have to accept the discomforts of rail passenger travel as one of the burdens of the war and should plan to travel as little as possible."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I wish to make a comment in connection with what Mr. Pelley has said in his letter concerning the inability of the railroads to obtain new passenger cars. Representatives of the ODT came to the committee of which I am chairman and asked what could be done to help the situation? They inquired if more freight and passenger cars could not be provided for the railroads. As chairman of the committee I went to the War Production Board and tried to obtain more transportation facilities for the railroads because the railroads needed more cars. One reason why the railroads needed more cars was that many of the men who could have been used to repair the cars had been called into the service. Frankly, the railroads have been handicapped, I believe, more than any other industry in the country because they have not been able to obtain priorities through the ODT from the War Production Board to build more passen-

ger and freight cars. The committee has considered the question time and time again. Complaints have come to us from both the ODT and some of the railroads themselves concerning failure to obtain needed equipment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana. I know the distinguished chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee will agree with me when I say that the railroads have done a highly successful and outstanding job; that their contribution to the war effort has been and will continue to be of the highest patriotic order; that never has there been so much accomplished with the minimum of equipment, manpower and facilities. I think the Senator will agree with that statement.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with what the Senator has just said. Frankly, the railroads have done a most remarkable job, one which the ODT itself as well as the Interstate Commerce Commission doubted they would be able to do when they began it. Sometimes the railroads themselves have wondered how they have been able to do it with a shortage of transportation facilities, of freight cars and engines. During the time the railroads and ODT were asking for priorities in order to provide additional railroad facilities we were building railroad cars, it is true, but they were being shipped to South America, to European countries, and to other countries of the world because it was stated they were needed in various parts of the world to carry on the war. The railroads of the United States have been seriously handicapped by reason of inability to secure cars and other equipment and facilities. The railroads have been particularly handicapped because of the difficulty in obtaining men to repair cars which were in the shops and needed repairs during this period of time.

Mr. LUCAS. I am obligated to the able Senator from Montana for that statement. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to railroad management throughout this country, and to the thousands upon thousands of loyal, patriotic workers who labored from morning to night and from night to morning in carrying on, in a most highly efficient and zealous manner, the work so desperately needed to be done in behalf of their country toward a successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say, in line with what the Senator from Montana has said, that too much praise cannot be given to the railroads for what they have done at home during the war. It should also be remembered that a great many railroad men, officers, and enlisted men were engaged in the European theaters of the war, as well as in other theaters, in the work which they were most capable of performing. As the Senator from Illinois has said, these men have been engaged in most hazardous work and have done a most outstanding and efficient job.

Mr. President, railroad officials and railroad men have operated the railroads which we have needed for our fighting in Europe, and they have done a most

marvelous job on that continent. Were it not for what they have done and are doing, it would be extremely difficult to move the Army and redeploy it in the efficient manner that has been done.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he has any information that would indicate how many soldiers or members of the armed forces the railroads will be called upon to move this year during the redeployment period?

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot give the Senator from Kentucky the correct figures. I presume that information as to the number of men who are being redeployed from Europe and coming back to this country and who, after the 30-day furlough, will be transferred to the Pacific, is more or less a military secret. With respect to those who are going to be discharged—and there are approximately 2,000,000 of them—I can say to the Senator that since May 12 some 300,000 of them have been returned to this country and have been discharged under the point system, or as physically unfit or for other reasons.

Mr. CHANDLER. I agree with what the Senator from Illinois has said. I think the railroads have done a magnificent job. During one of the early years of the war I undertook to keep somewhat of a record of what the railroads were doing. They carried 12,000,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines. We did not have that many in service, but one serviceman was perhaps carried several times. They carried 80,000,000 tons of freight a year in that important early period of the war.

I think one of the main troubles is that when someone in the newspapers or on the radio announces that there is going to be a ban on travel, civilians begin to travel in order to beat that ban. If someone would say over the radio that there is plenty of space people would not rush to travel. Conditions of travel would be more normal. When it is said that there is going to be a shortage of this, that, or the other food everyone becomes excited and tries to get a supply and of course there will be a shortage as a result. Sometimes people are told that a certain article will not be produced any more, and that if we do not buy this one there will be no further opportunity to obtain it. When it is said that something is no longer going to be made or sold everyone rushes to buy, and pretty soon the supply is exhausted. I think it would be well if the railroads were let alone. They are carrying all the passengers they can and are doing a magnificent job. Of course, planning can be done with respect to anything, but it is inconceivable that a system which carried 12,000,000 servicemen in 1 year in the early part of the war cannot take care of the travel necessitated by the redeployment of our troops.

Mr. LUCAS. What the Senator said a moment ago recalls to my mind the old lady in my section of the country who never drank coffee; but when coffee rationing was started, she immediately began to store coffee until she had several pounds of it. Then when rationing was



removed, she had the coffee and did not know what to do with it. That is illustrative of one of the points the Senator made.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. As a former member of the Mead committee, I do not intend to speak in defense of that committee, but I think I should express a hope. Something was said by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] to the effect that the committee might be compelled to change its plans and do something which it otherwise would not have done had it not been for this debate. Knowing that committee, and knowing how anxiously it has worked throughout the years for the national defense, I hope the committee will not be disturbed by the debate, but will carry out its own original program.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. In line with what we have been saying about the transportation situation in the United States let me say that because of the shortage of transportation I wrote a letter to the ODT and sent a copy of it to the President of the United States. I had received complaints from various sources when statements were issued to the effect that the Government agencies in Washington ought to curtail the great amount of travel in pullman cars from one end of the country to the other by members of such agencies. I wrote a letter to the ODT, and sent a copy of it to the President of the United States, suggesting that something should be done during this emergency to keep Government agencies from using up the transportation resources of the country by travel from place to place in pullman cars all over the United States. I understand that the ODT has forwarded the letter which I wrote to that agency to the various departments, telling them that they should curtail such travel.

This morning I received a letter from the President of the United States, from Potsdam, saying that he entirely agreed with me in that respect. So I am hopeful that something will be done to curb the various bureaus in their use of travel facilities all over the country when the soldiers are so anxious to get home.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the statement of the Senator from Montana. I have no data before me on the question, but certainly if the bureaus are doing any unnecessary traveling, they ought to curtail such travel, just as any other organization or individual should curtail travel so that travel facilities may be used to the greatest advantage for the returning soldier.

I wish to proceed with Mr. Pelley's letter. It is not very long. I desire to conclude the debate.

Mr. Pelley further states:

Elsewhere in its report the committee observed:

"The unprecedented increase in the volume of traffic has approached dangerously near the limit of the capacity of our transport facilities. Replenishment needs of trans-

portation agencies in terms of manpower, materials, and facilities are modest in comparison with total war requirements and entail practically no public financing. Failure to provide for those needs would be to run the risk of break-down. A transportation collapse would be disastrous to the war effort."

On that point the conclusion of the committee was:

"Our wartime experience indicates the importance of maintaining a sound and healthy railroad system as an instrument of national defense. The production of adequate numbers of locomotives, freight cars, rail, and other railroad facilities is, therefore, imperative."

That was in December 1943. The situation then recognized by the committee has continued since that time but the continuing pressure of other war needs was such that the Government authorities did not allocate the necessary material for any additional railroad passenger cars.

Recently, since VE-day, the War Production Board has authorized the construction by the Defense Plant Corporation of 1,200 special troop sleepers, to be leased to and paid for by the railroads on a mileage basis, and to be operated by the Pullman Co. in exclusive military service. The sleepers so authorized, the delivery of which will start in September, it is hoped, are of the same design as the 1,237 troop sleepers built late in 1943 and early in 1944, for the same purpose.

To make more sleeping cars currently available for military use, the Office of Defense Transportation on July 6 issued its order No. 53, requiring the discontinuance of sleeping car service on all runs between cities 450 miles or less apart by the shortest rail line distance. This order added 892 sleeping cars to the number which could be drawn upon for military use.

I wish to commend Col. Monroe Johnson for taking that position with respect to sleeping cars, and making available practically a thousand more sleeping cars to take care of soldiers traveling across the country.

Mr. Pelley further states:

With the withdrawal of these cars, there now are in regular train service 2,544 out of a total of 6,797 Pullman-owned sleeping cars, according to the reports of the Pullman Co. as of July 15, 1945. The remainder of the pullman fleet, 4,253 cars or 62 percent of the total, is available for military service. From the number of cars available, whether for military service or regular trains, there must be deducted those which from time to time have to be taken out of service for repairs.

In addition, there are the 1,237 special troop sleepers referred to above. Including these cars, there are a total of 5,490 sleeping cars available for military service, or 68 percent of all sleeping cars of all types. The percentage of total beds in sleeping cars available for military service is still higher, since many of the cars remaining in regular train service are of types which do not have sleeping accommodations for as many persons as either the standard sleeping cars or the special troop sleepers.

Here is something that is important:

The procedure in handling special troop movements is that the Army or the Navy calls upon the railroads for the necessary trains, specifying sleeping cars or coaches, according to the length of the movement. Sleeping cars are ordered on the basis of three men to a section by the Army and two to a section by the Navy. The latter practice will be made uniform with that of the Army under the provisions of an ODT order issued yesterday.

That means that under that order the Navy will be in the same situation as the

Army so far as the number of men sleeping in one section is concerned.

Where coaches are ordered they are on the basis of three men to two double seats, or four single seats. If sleeping cars cannot be furnished promptly for the movements as ordered, trains are made up of coaches, frequently taken out of regular service for the purpose. For example, all eight cars in the widely publicized transcontinental troop train which was reported to have been made up of commuter type coaches, were taken from regularly intercity trains of the New Haven Railroad, including such well-known trains as the Yankee Clipper, the Nathan Hale, and the Bankers Special. Six of these eight cars came back from the Pacific coast in regular service, occupied by regular revenue passengers, without complaint on their part.

In connection with your request for information concerning the movement of German war prisoners: We have not been asked by the Army to furnish, nor have we furnished, sleeping cars for German war prisoners, except in a limited number of cases where Army doctors certified the need for such cars to move prisoners in serious physical condition. The confusion may have arisen from the fact that on straight trains of prisoners, we frequently have one or more sleeping cars for the accommodation of the Army guards, who have to sleep part of the time and work part of the time while in transit.

These regular trains are usually referred to as "civilian" trains. Actually there are no civilian trains on our railroads today. Regular trains are used to a very large extent for military travel, both by men on duty traveling under orders in small parties or as individuals, and by men traveling at their own expense on the special furlough fare of one and a quarter cents per mile offered by the railroads to servicemen.

To sum up, the redeployment of the armed forces presents the most difficult transportation problem of the entire war. It is to be accomplished not just by itself but in connection with the carrying of other military and essential civilian traffic. The forces which we were building up in Europe over a period of almost 4 years are to be redeployed in less than 10 months. In working out the details of this most difficult problem, the railroads have enjoyed the thoroughgoing cooperation both of the armed forces and of the ODT. It was known before the redeployment started that there are not enough sleeping cars in the country to do the job within the time available, but every effort is being made both by the railroads and by the Government agencies concerned to secure the maximum use of equipment in getting the soldiers from the ports to their homes, from their homes to the reassembly centers, and from there to the Pacific ports, above all, promptly and with as much comfort as can be provided with facilities limited by the Government's other needs.

All of us deeply regret that the needs of war convinced those in Government who had final authority to determine the question that it was not desirable to permit the railroads to secure the equipment needed to handle in this emergency the demands of traffic, both civilian and military, according to the normal peacetime standards of the railroads of this country.

Yours very truly,

J. J. PELLEY.

Mr. President, I have a letter from J. Monroe Johnson, of the Office of Defense Transportation, in which he encloses a copy of a letter written on July 18 by Fred M. Vinson, Director of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, to the Secretary of War. I ask

unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF WAR MOBILIZATION  
AND RECONVERSION,  
Washington, D. C., July 18, 1945.  
The Honorable SECRETARY OF WAR,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Colonel Johnson, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, informs me that it is necessary for him to know not only the over-all number of returning soldiers, etc., under the 10-month redeployment program, but also the expected arrivals well in advance of the current month and the next succeeding month. In addition to that he must be informed beforehand of the extreme fluctuations in the flow of troops to the United States, particularly as to any increase in the monthly expectations, and he should be consulted before any great changes upward or downward are decided upon by the War Department.

Colonel Johnson tells me that, whereas he together with the general public was informed that about 150,000 troops, other than those by air, were expected to return in June, purely by accident he discovered on the 26th of June that the arrivals for that month would be over 200,000, in addition to those by air. Again quite by chance in conversation over the phone with General Gross, he learned on July 7 that not approximately 250,000 troops would return in July, as he together with the general public had been informed, but instead, 353,000 were to arrive in that month.

In addition to the information stated above, Colonel Johnson must know in advance of any changes so that he may determine whether or not transportation has the capacity to perform the increases proposed and in order that he may make use of any surplus equipment in other badly needed movements when the fluctuation is downward. For instance, quite recently in 3 days about 60,000 servicemen arrived, 35,000 in one of those days. Better control is necessary and essential to secure a more even flow of troops. While fluctuations of this sort might be absorbed in the early stages of redeployment, presently when the railroads are performing at once all of the seven moves per man, any such change will necessarily result in great discomfort to soldiers, even if such transportation can be accomplished at all.

Colonel Johnson further emphatically informs me that he was not consulted as to this 10-month redeployment program. That was decided upon without consultation. He says that, unless the manpower shortage is remedied, and at once, transportation has not the capacity to perform this 10-month redeployment.

Very truly yours,

FRED M. VINSON, Director.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of Senators to the fact that we shall vote at 2 o'clock on the pending business. I desire to discuss it, and I prefer not to have time taken now for the consideration of other matters.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska for 1 minute.

Mr. WHERRY. I request the privilege of asking a question at this time, and I should also like to state for the RECORD that I am very much interested in the subject which has been brought before the Senate by the senior Senator from Illinois. I should like to ask him a question, or I will ask it of any member of the

Committee on Military Affairs. Complimenting the Army and the railroads for bringing the boys home is one thing, but I should like to ask how many boys are actually being discharged; what is the reduction in the armed forces? My understanding is we are bringing the boys home, but are sending most of them to the Pacific. I understand that less than 400,000 of them have actually been discharged, and that we are still inducting more than 70,000 men a month, so numerically we are not discharging men from the service, but actually are increasing the number of our military forces.

What is the strength of our Army? Has not the statement of General Hershey come true—the statement quoted by Governor Dewey?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the Senator's question is going to precipitate a discussion, I must decline to yield further. I said to the Senator from Nebraska that I would yield to him for a minute, and I hope he will conform to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the minute is up, I shall ask the question on Monday morning, after the Mead committee has made the investigation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am ready to answer the question now.

Mr. WHERRY. Well, Mr. President, we cannot have the benefit of the Senator's reply now since the time the Senator from West Virginia has allowed has expired, I am sorry to say.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO COMPROMISE, ADJUST, OR CANCEL CERTAIN INDEBTEDNESS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. On behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Senate bill 230, and to submit a report (No. 507) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be read by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 230) to amend Public Law 518, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 20, 1944.

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration and passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield for that purpose?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I understand that I will lose the floor if I do so. If I can still retain the floor and if the bill can be acted upon promptly, I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota explain the bill?

Mr. LANGER. The bill is reported on behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It provides

for the settlement of drought claims of over \$1,000 in the same way that those under \$1,000 are settled.

The bill is unanimously reported by the committee, and both sides have agreed. There is no objection by anyone.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should like to understand a little more about the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have the floor. If consideration of the bill will require discussion, I ask that the discussion be closed now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia declines to yield further. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Subsequently,

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, today the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported favorably Senate bill 230, introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], to amend the act of December 20, 1944, which authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel debts of farmers not to exceed a thousand dollars. That is the present law.

The bill was submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture, and he suggested an amendment, which has been incorporated in the report of the committee. So that the effect of the bill now, as reported, is that whereas the law limited the ability of the Secretary of Agriculture to settle these debts up to a thousand dollars, the amended bill authorizes him to settle debts above a thousand dollars where they apply to droughts, rural rehabilitation, and emergency relief loans made prior to June 30, 1940. It is important that the bill pass, and therefore I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the bill was called to my attention earlier in the day, and I have made an effort to canvass the minority members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have talked with six or eight of them, and I find no opposition among them to the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, early in the session, when this bill was introduced, I had a brief conference with the Senator from North Dakota with regard to it. Since then I have examined the report fully, and I am well satisfied with its provisions. The removal of the thousand dollar limitation by no means has removed the other conditions which are required for the approval of the settlement of debts, which are very stringent conditions. I think a loan must be more than 5 years old, it must have been ascertained that the loan cannot be paid, and that it was entered into in good faith.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from Ohio. In its present form the bill permits the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust, settle, cancel, or compromise debts above a thousand dollars where they were made on account of drought, rural rehabilitation, or emergency matters, and in that case he can do it only under certain conditions, which are rigid. I hope the Senate will agree to



take the bill up, and that it may be passed, with the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which considered the proposed legislation, I wish to express my entire agreement with the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio. The provision of the bill for relief of impecunious debtors is one under which the Government has ample protection, and the conditions for relief are most stringent.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's statement. It is a meritorious proposal, and amply protects the Government. I ask that the bill be disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments. The amendments were, in line 6, after "Seventy-eight", to strike out "Congress" and insert "Congress"; and in line 7, after the word "by", to strike out "inserting the word 'and' between the semicolon and (3); by changing the semicolon at the end of the third proviso therein to a period; and by striking the proviso numbered (4) therein" and insert "changing the period at the end of the fourth proviso to a comma and adding the following immediately thereafter: 'except that such \$1,000 limitation shall not apply to drought, rural rehabilitation, and emergency relief loans made prior to June 30, 1940'", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 1 of the act approved December 20, 1944, entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to compromise, adjust, or cancel certain indebtedness, and for other purposes" (Public Law 518, 78th Cong.), is hereby amended by changing the period at the end of the fourth proviso to a comma and adding the following immediately thereafter: "except that such \$1,000 limitation shall not apply to drought, rural rehabilitation, and emergency relief loans made prior to June 30, 1940."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MEMBERSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES IN THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 145) providing for membership of the United States in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, at this time I desire to resume the discussion of House Joint Resolution 145, which deals with the membership of this country in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Yesterday, when the measure was suddenly called up, I opposed the motion for immediate consideration because I thought it was a matter of such transcending importance that the Senate

should not proceed to consider it without first having an opportunity to make a careful study of it. After considerable discussion, the motion was agreed to. The majority leader very considerably passed the matter over until today for a final vote, and thus we achieved the purpose of the motion to the extent of gaining a night during which we could consider the proposed measure.

In the debate which took place yesterday the sponsor of the resolution, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] made statements which very clearly set forth his views. I know of no Senator whose statements may be sooner accepted as an interpretation of a measure, or be given more weight, than the statements of the Senator from Vermont when he sponsors legislation upon the floor of the Senate. That is particularly true when there is doubt with reference to its meaning.

I read the following statements which were made by the able Senator from Vermont with respect to the pending legislation:

It does not relate to any reformation of our economic system, any exercise of dictatorial power, any movement of masses of people, any modification of our immigration laws, or any interference with the domestic life of any other country on earth.

Again, the Senator made the following statement during the course of the debate:

I can say to the Senator definitely, "No," there is not one single obligation on the United States created by this joint resolution, excepting the necessary contribution to the Fund. There is no other obligation whatever, and the United States and every other member of this organization will be just as free after it signs and becomes a member as it was before. It will be vastly richer, however.

If the Senate adopts this measure—and it appears from the vote yesterday that it will be adopted—I assume that it will be adopted with the understanding placed upon the law as it was stated by the able Senator from Vermont who sponsors the measure. In other words, the measure will place no obligation upon this country beyond that of providing funds. There is a grave danger of taking from the people of this country their very freedom. The question which arose in my mind, and the consideration which more than anything else caused me to oppose consideration of the measure was the report of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture, for I was convinced that it was to be an important step in furthering the organization.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, what page of the RECORD was the last statement which the Senator read?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was reading from near the middle of the first column on page 7857, and from near the end of the last column on the same page, extending over onto the top of the first column on page 7858. I was reading from the remarks of the Senator from Vermont which he made yesterday.

Mr. President, I believe that the Senate should consider with great seriousness the action of the United Nations

Conference on Food and Agriculture which was held at Hot Springs, Va., from May 18, 1943, to June 3, 1943. I have before me the final act and section reports of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture.

The constitution to which we are asked to subscribe provides that that international body shall recommend to the nations what they may do with regard to certain subjects. The meeting which was held at Hot Springs, Va., in great secrecy was the initial meeting which was held upon the subject of food and agriculture. Approximately 20 nations were represented at the meeting, including the United States, which was the host of the other nations. Our country initiated the holding of the meeting. From the meeting came what? Recommendations. There came from that Conference the same recommendations which the permanent organization may make and under the same power.

What causes me to be apprehensive, as it has caused others to be apprehensive, is the recommendation contained in the report of the Hot Springs Conference, which antedated the writing of the constitution. It was made prior to the constitution to which it is proposed that we shall subscribe. The Conference made recommendations, just as the constitution provides that the permanent organization shall make recommendations upon the subject of food and agriculture.

I wish to have shown in the RECORD one of the recommendations made by the Conference at Hot Springs. It reads as follows:

Where agricultural settlements are possible appropriate steps should be taken to facilitate the movement of people from overmanned agricultural areas.

In order to help in intranational and international migration, where these are feasible—

(I) Occupational training should be provided;

(II) Labor bureaus should be set up where necessary;

(III) Transportation, communication, housing, sanitation, health, and other public facilities necessary to effective settlement should be provided by the country receiving the migrants;

(IV) Steps should be taken to provide for the economic security of the migrants.

(e) Where emigration is possible an international organization should support arrangements to provide adequate safeguards for the settlers and for the countries concerned and to facilitate the movement through other appropriate means.

Mr. President, there is a recommendation that this world organization on food and agriculture shall have the power to move people not only from one settlement within a country to another place within the same country, but that it shall also have the power, on its order, to move people from one country to another.

I do not believe this country wants to subscribe to that or will subscribe to it, but if that recommendation was made in the first meeting and the first Conference held on this subject, what will happen when recommendations are made under the constitution to which we are asked to subscribe?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I regret to interrupt the address of the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to have the Senator ask a question.

Mr. AUSTIN. I looked up the RECORD to which the Senator referred, as to the statement made by me, and I think that in fairness to him I should call attention to the very language so that if he cares to discuss it he may. If he will yield for that purpose—

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want the language. I thought I read it.

Mr. AUSTIN. I should like to read the reply I made to the interrogatory by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. This was my reply:

I can say to the Senator definitely, "No"; there is not one single obligation on the United States created by this joint resolution, excepting the necessary contribution to the Fund.

I want the Senator to know, so he will not be misled by that statement, that of course I did not undertake to abrogate the constitution which we are accepting. The joint resolution itself provides, in section 5:

In adopting this joint resolution the Congress does so with the understanding that paragraph 2 of article XIII—

Which is the one relating to amendments—

does not authorize the Conference of the Organization to so modify the provisions of its constitution as to involve any new obligation for the United States.

Of course, the Senator has by this time read the constitution, and knows that there are obligations in the constitution, and if the Senator has no objection to my doing so, since it may save time, I should like to have the constitution printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have no objection whatsoever.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed what appears in the report under the title "Constitution of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations," pages 1 to 7 of the report. Page 7 includes annex I, Nations Eligible for Original Membership, and annex 2, Budget for the First Financial Year. I should like to have those annexes in the RECORD in connection with our colloquy.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CONSTITUTION OF THE FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

##### PREAMBLE

The nations accepting this constitution, being determined to promote the common welfare by furthering separate and collective action on their part for the purposes of raising levels of nutrition and standards of living of the peoples under their respective jurisdictions, securing improvements in the efficiency of the production and distribution of all food and agricultural products, bettering the condition of rural populations, and thus

contributing toward an expanding world economy, hereby establish the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, hereinafter referred to as the "Organization," through which the members will report to one another on the measures taken and the progress achieved in the fields of action set forth above.

##### ARTICLE I (FUNCTIONS OF THE ORGANIZATION)

1. The Organization shall collect, analyze, interpret, and disseminate information relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture.

2. The Organization shall promote and, where appropriate, shall recommend national and international action with respect to

(a) scientific, technological, social, and economic research relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture;

(b) the improvement of education and admiration relating to nutrition, food, and agriculture, and the spread of public knowledge of nutritional and agricultural science and practice;

(c) the conservation of natural resources and the adoption of improved methods of agricultural production;

(d) the improvement of the processing, marketing, and distribution of food and agricultural products;

(e) the adoption of policies for the provision of adequate agricultural credit, national and international;

(f) the adoption of international policies with respect to agricultural commodity arrangements.

3. It shall also be the function of the Organization

(a) to furnish such technical assistance as governments may request;

(b) to organize, in cooperation with the governments concerned, such missions as may be needed to assist them to fulfill the obligations arising from their acceptance of the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on Food and Agriculture; and

(c) generally to take all necessary and appropriate action to implement the purposes of the Organization as set forth in the preamble.

##### ARTICLE II (MEMBERSHIP)

1. The original members of the Organization shall be such of the nations specified in annex I as accept this constitution in accordance with the provisions of article XXI.

2. Additional members may be admitted to the Organization by a vote concurred in by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Conference and upon acceptance of this constitution as in force at the time of admission.

##### ARTICLE III (THE CONFERENCE)

1. There shall be a Conference of the Organization in which each member nation shall be represented by one member.

2. Each member nation may appoint an alternate, associates, and advisers to its member of the Conference. The Conference may make rules concerning the participation of alternates, associates, and advisers in its proceedings, but any such participation shall be without the right to vote except in the case of an alternate or associate participating in the place of a member.

3. No member of the Conference may represent more than one member nation.

4. Each member nation shall have only one vote.

5. The Conference may invite any public international organization which has responsibilities related to those of the Organization to appoint a representative who shall participate in its meetings on the condition prescribed by the Conference. No such representative shall have the right to vote.

6. The Conference shall meet at least once in every year.

7. The Conference shall elect its own officers, regulate its own procedure, and make rules governing the convocation of sessions and the determination of agenda.

8. Except as otherwise expressly provided in this constitution or by rules made by the Conference, all matters shall be decided by the Conference by a simple majority of the votes cast.

##### ARTICLE IV (FUNCTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE)

1. The Conference shall determine the policy and approve the budget of the Organization and shall exercise the other powers conferred upon it by the constitution.

2. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast make recommendations concerning questions relating to food and agriculture to be submitted to member nations for consideration with a view to implementation by national action.

3. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast submit conventions concerning questions relating to food and agriculture to member nations for consideration with a view to their acceptance by the appropriate constitutional procedure.

4. The Conference shall make rules laying down the procedure to be followed to secure:

(a) proper consultation with governments and adequate technical preparation prior to consideration by the Conference of proposed recommendations and conventions; and

(b) proper consultation with governments in regard to relations between the Organization and national institutions or private persons.

5. The Conference may make recommendations to any public international organization regarding any matter pertaining to the purpose of the Organization.

6. The Conference may by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast agree to discharge any other functions consistent with the purposes of the Organization which may be assigned to it by governments or provided for by any arrangement between the Organization and any other public international organization.

##### ARTICLE V (THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE)

1. The Conference shall appoint an Executive Committee consisting of not less than 9 or more than 15 members or alternates or associate members of the Conference or their advisers who are qualified by administrative experience or other special qualifications to contribute to the attainment of the purpose of the Organization. There shall be not more than one member from any member nation. The tenure and other conditions of office of the members of the Executive Committee shall be subject to rules to be made by the Conference.

2. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article, the Conference shall have regard in appointing the Executive Committee to the desirability that its membership should reflect as varied as possible an experience of different types of economy in relation to food and agriculture.

3. The Conference may delegate to the Executive Committee such powers as it may determine, with the exception of the powers set forth in paragraph 2 of article II, article IV, paragraph 1 of article VII, article XIII, and article XX of this constitution.

4. The members of the Executive Committee shall exercise the powers delegated to them by the Conference on behalf of the whole Conference and not as representatives of their respective governments.

5. The Executive Committee shall appoint its own officers and, subject to any decisions of the Conference, shall regulate its own procedure.

##### ARTICLE VI (OTHER COMMITTEES AND CONFERENCES)

1. The Conference may establish technical and regional standing committees and may appoint committees to study and report on any matter pertaining to the purpose of the Organization.



2. The Conference may convene general, technical, regional, or other special conferences and may provide for the representation at such conferences, in such manner as it may determine, of national and international bodies concerned with nutrition, food, and agriculture.

#### ARTICLE VII (THE DIRECTOR GENERAL)

1. There shall be a director general of the Organization, who shall be appointed by the Conference by such procedure and on such terms as it may determine.

2. Subject to the general supervision of the Conference and its Executive Committee, the director general shall have full power and authority to direct the work of the Organization.

3. The director general or a representative designated by him shall participate, without the right to vote, in all meetings of the Conference and of its Executive Committee and shall formulate for consideration by the Conference and the Executive Committee proposals for appropriate action in regard to matters coming before them.

#### ARTICLE VIII (STAFF)

1. The staff of the Organization shall be appointed by the Director General in accordance with such procedure as may be determined by rules made by the Conference.

2. The staff of the Organization shall be responsible to the Director General. Their responsibilities shall be exclusively international in character and they shall not seek or receive instructions in regard to the discharge thereof from any authority external to the Organization. The member nations undertake fully to respect the international character of the responsibilities of the staff and not to seek to influence any of their nationals in the discharge of such responsibilities.

3. In appointing the staff the Director General shall, subject to the paramount importance of securing the highest standards of efficiency and of technical competence, pay due regard to the importance of selecting personnel recruited on as wide a geographical basis as is possible.

4. Each member nation undertakes, insofar as it may be possible under its constitutional procedure, to accord to the Director General and senior staff diplomatic privileges and immunities and to accord to other members of the staff all facilities and immunities accorded to nondiplomatic personnel attached to diplomatic missions, or alternatively to accord to such other members of the staff the immunities and facilities which may hereafter be accorded to equivalent members of the staffs of other public international organizations.

#### ARTICLE IX (SEAT)

The seat of the Organization shall be determined by the Conference.

#### ARTICLE X (REGIONAL AND LIAISON OFFICES)

1. There shall be such regional offices as the Director General with the approval of the Conference may decide.

2. The Director General may appoint officials for liaison with particular countries or areas subject to the agreement of the government concerned.

#### ARTICLE XI (REPORTS BY MEMBERS)

1. Each member nation shall communicate periodically to the Organization reports on the progress made toward achieving the purpose of the Organization set forth in the preamble and on the action taken on the basis of recommendations made and conventions submitted by the Conference.

2. These reports shall be made at such times and in such form and shall contain such particulars as the Conference may request.

3. The Director-General shall submit these reports, together with analyses thereof, to the Conference and shall publish such re-

ports and analyses as may be approved for publication by the Conference together with any reports relating thereto adopted by the Conference.

4. The Director-General may request any Member nation to submit information relating to the purpose of the Organization.

5. Each member nation shall, on request, communicate to the Organization, on publication, all laws and regulations and official reports and statistics concerning nutrition, food, and agriculture.

#### ARTICLE XII (COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS)

1. In order to provide for close cooperation between the Organization and other public international organizations with related responsibilities, the Conference may, subject to the provisions of article XIII, enter into agreements with the competent authorities of such organizations defining the distribution of responsibilities and methods of cooperation.

2. The Director-General may, subject to any decisions of the Conference, enter into agreements with other public international organizations for the maintenance of common services, for common arrangements in regard to recruitment, training, conditions of service, and other related matters, and for interchanges of staff.

#### ARTICLE XIII (RELATION TO ANY GENERAL WORLD ORGANIZATION)

1. The Organization shall, in accordance, with the procedure provided for in the following paragraph, constitute a part of any general international organization to which may be entrusted the coordination of the activities of international organizations with specialized responsibilities.

2. Arrangements for defining the relations between the Organization and any such general organization shall be subject to the approval of the Conference. Notwithstanding the provisions of article XX, such arrangements may, if approved by the Conference by a two-thirds majority of the votes cast, involve modification of the provisions of this constitution: *Provided*, That no such arrangements shall modify the purposes and limitations of the Organization as set forth in this constitution.

#### ARTICLE XIV (SUPERVISION OF OTHER ORGANIZATIONS)

The Conference may approve arrangements placing other public international organizations dealing with questions relating to food and agriculture under the general authority of the Organization on such terms as may be agreed with the competent authorities of the organization concerned.

#### ARTICLE XV (LEGAL STATUS)

1. The Organization shall have the capacity of a legal person to perform any legal act appropriate to its purpose which is not beyond the powers granted to it by this constitution.

2. Each member nation undertakes, insofar as it may be possible under its constitutional procedure, to accord to the Organization all the immunities and facilities which it accords to diplomatic missions, including inviolability of premises and archives, immunity from suit, and exemptions from taxation.

3. The Conference shall make provision for the determination by an administrative tribunal of disputes relating to the conditions and terms of appointment of members of the staff.

#### ARTICLE XVI (FISH AND FOREST PRODUCTS)

In this constitution the term "agriculture" and its derivatives include fisheries, marine products, forestry, and primary forestry products.

#### ARTICLE XVII (INTERPRETATION OF CONSTITUTION)

Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation of this constitution or any in-

ternational convention adopted thereunder shall be referred for determination to an appropriate international court or arbitral tribunal in the manner prescribed by rules to be adopted by the Conference.

#### ARTICLE XVIII (EXPENSES)

1. Subject to the provisions of article XXV, the Director-General shall submit to the conference an annual budget covering the anticipated expenses of the Organization. Upon approval of a budget the total amount approved shall be allocated among the member nations in proportions determined, from time to time, by the Conference. Each member nation undertakes, subject to the requirements of its constitutional procedure, to contribute to the Organization promptly its share of the expenses so determined.

2. Each member nation shall, upon its acceptance of this constitution, pay as its first contribution its proportion of the annual budget for the current financial year.

3. The financial year of the organization shall be July 1 to June 30 unless the Conference should otherwise determine.

#### ARTICLE XIX (WITHDRAWAL)

Any member nation may give notice of withdrawal from the Organization at any time after the expiration of 4 years from the date of its acceptance of this constitution. Such notice shall take effect 1 year after the date of its communication to the director general of the Organization subject to the member nation's having at that time paid its annual contribution for each year of its membership, including the financial year following the date of such notice.

#### ARTICLE XX (AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION)

1. Amendments to this constitution involving new obligations for member nations shall require the approval of the Conference by a vote concurred in by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Conference and shall take effect on acceptance by two-thirds of the member nations for each member nation accepting the amendment and thereafter for each remaining member nation on acceptance by it.

2. Other amendments shall take effect on adoption by the Conference by a vote concurred in by a two-thirds majority of all the members of the Conference.

#### ARTICLE XXI (ENTRY INTO FORCE OF CONSTITUTION)

1. This constitution shall be open to acceptance by the nations specified in annex I.

2. The instruments of acceptance shall be transmitted by each government to the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, which shall notify their receipt to the governments of the nations specified in annex I. Acceptance may be notified to the Interim Commission through a diplomatic representative, in which case the instrument of acceptance must be transmitted to the Commission as soon as possible thereafter.

3. Upon the receipt by the Interim Commission of 20 notifications of acceptance, the Interim Commission shall arrange for this constitution to be signed in a single copy by the diplomatic representatives, duly authorized thereto, of the nations who shall have notified their acceptance, and upon being so signed on behalf of not less than 20 of the nations specified in annex I this constitution shall come into force immediately.

4. Acceptances the notification of which is received after the entry into force of this constitution shall become effective upon receipt by the Interim Commission or the Organization.

#### ARTICLE XXII (FIRST SESSION OF THE CONFERENCE)

The United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture shall convene the first session of the Conference to meet at a suitable date after the entry into force of this constitution.

## ARTICLE XXIII (LANGUAGES)

Pending the adoption by the Conference of any rules regarding languages, the business of the Conference shall be transacted in English.

## ARTICLE XXIV (TEMPORARY SEAT)

The temporary seat of the Organization shall be at Washington unless the Conference should otherwise determine.

## ARTICLE XXV (FIRST FINANCIAL YEAR)

The following exceptional arrangements shall apply in respect of the financial year in which this constitution comes into force:

(a) The budget shall be the provisional budget set forth in annex II to this constitution; and

(b) The amounts to be contributed by the member nations shall be in the proportions set forth in annex II to this constitution: *Provided*, That each member nation may deduct therefrom the amount already contributed by it toward the expenses of the Interim Commission.

## ARTICLE XXVI (DISSOLUTION OF THE INTERIM COMMISSION)

On the opening of the first session of the Conference, the United Nations Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture shall be deemed to be dissolved and its records and other property shall become the property of the Organization.

## ANNEX I. NATIONS ELIGIBLE FOR ORIGINAL MEMBERSHIP

Australia	Iran
Belgium	Iraq
Bolivia	Liberia
Brazil	Luxembourg
Canada	Mexico
Chile	Netherlands
China	New Zealand
Colombia	Nicaragua
Costa Rica	Norway
Cuba	Panama
Czechoslovakia	Paraguay
Denmark	Peru
Dominican Republic	Philippine Commonwealth
Ecuador	Poland
Egypt	Union of South Africa
El Salvador	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Ethiopia	United Kingdom
France	United States of America
Greece	Uruguay
Guatemala	Venezuela
Haiti	Yugoslavia
Honduras	
Iceland	
India	

## ANNEX II. BUDGET FOR THE FIRST FINANCIAL YEAR

The provisional budget for the first financial year shall be a sum of 2,500,000 United States dollars, the unspent balance of which shall constitute the nucleus of a capital fund.

This sum shall be contributed by the member nations in the following proportions:

	Percent
Australia	3.33
Belgium	1.28
Bolivia	.29
Brazil	3.46
Canada	5.06
Chile	1.15
China	6.50
Colombia	.71
Costa Rica	.05
Cuba	.71
Czechoslovakia	1.40
Denmark	.62
Dominican Republic	.05
Ecuador	.05
Egypt	1.73
El Salvador	.05
Ethiopia	.29
France	5.69
Greece	.38
Guatemala	.05
Haiti	.05

	Percent
Honduras	.05
Iceland	.05
India	4.25
Iran	.71
Iraq	.44
Liberia	.05
Luxembourg	.05
Mexico	1.87
Netherlands	1.38
New Zealand	1.15
Nicaragua	.05
Norway	.62
Panama	.05
Paraguay	.05
Peru	.71
Philippines	.25
Poland	1.19
Union of South Africa	2.31
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	8.00
United Kingdom	15.00
United States of America	25.00
Uruguay	.58
Venezuela	.58
Yugoslavia	.71
Provision for new members	2.00
Total	100.00

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to say to the Senator from Vermont that he did use the language further, as appears on page 7857 of the RECORD, in answer to a question propounded by the Senator from Kentucky—quoting the Senator from Vermont:

There is no other obligation whatever, and the United States and every other member of this Organization will be just as free after it signs and becomes a member as it was before. It will be vastly richer, however.

In the light of that statement, I hope that when this constitution may be adopted the view expressed here will be the understanding of the Senator from Vermont, that we enter this organization without destroying the freedom of the people of this country in any respect whatsoever, that we have no intention of setting up an international organization which may make recommendations which are destructive in any sense of the right of a man to select the community in which he may live, and that in no sense do we accede to the recommendations contained in the prior report from Hot Springs, which recommend that people be moved from community to community in our own country, and moved from one country to another. That is the apprehension I have about this whole measure. If the organization is set up and we enter into it with this recommendation, made prior to the constitution itself, by the same representatives who are interested in creating this world organization on agriculture and food, we do so with full notice that the same recommendation can be made again.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. I regret that the Senator from West Virginia keeps talking about that subject.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is the most important part of it.

Mr. AUSTIN. In my opinion it does not belong here, and would not be here if the Senator did not import it into the debate. I wish to say to the Senator that never until I heard him read here yesterday from that document have I, in all

the discussions, lasting more than a year and a half, heard that idea even discussed. In all the work sheets which represented this constitution from time to time that thought never was intruded, and it does not color in the least the product which is before us now, and it should not be considered in connection with this question. I fear the Senator is doing his cause harm by emphasizing that point.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont, I am certain that he does not subscribe to the idea which I have read from the recommendations of the Hot Springs Conference.

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course not.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But at the same time, even though he does not subscribe to it, the representatives of the United States Government at that food conference subscribed to it, and signed that recommendation, and what the Senator from Vermont and I may subscribe to is a very different thing from what has been actually done in the way of a recommendation by representatives of the United States.

I can understand some other country subscribing to the idea and recommending international migration of people, but I cannot for the life of me understand any administration of this country or any representative of the free American Government signing such a recommendation. To say that I have imported this into the argument is not correct. I did not import it very far, because this is the report and the recommendation of the first conference which was held.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion at that point?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. That characterization of it might be confused with something else which is referred to in the joint resolution. What is referred to in the joint resolution as the first report is something entirely different from what the Senator is discussing.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; the report referred to in the joint resolution is the report of August 1, 1944.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct, and it is entitled "First Report to the Governments of the United Nations by the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture." I want to make certain that the record is kept straight on what the identification of that is.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think I have kept it straight. I have certainly tried to do so, because this is a report after the first meeting held by the United Nations at Hot Springs, Va., from May 18 to June 3, 1943.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, may I submit a question to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that when the original draft of the pending constitution for this international food organization came to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, it contained numerous suggestions which were wholly unacceptable and wholly unsatisfactory to the members of the committee. I would say



that in its original form the committee almost unanimously would have thrown it out the window.

As a result of that attitude, the Foreign Relations Committee created a special subcommittee to filter the entire product and create a new one, and it was at that point that the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and the able Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] served a very useful function. The net product they brought back to us was shed of all of these things which were so objectionable in the first instance. I recall that the Senator from Vermont did me the courtesy of submitting the original document to me and suggesting that I give him my comment in writing, and I gave him a memorandum complaining just as bitterly about the terms of the subsequent document as the Senator now complains about this ancient document.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I may say to the Senator at this point that the ancient document of which the Senator speaks—

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am trying to discriminate between that and this.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Meaning the Hot Springs document?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Was one which was signed by our American representatives, containing recommendations. Are the representatives of our country going to make recommendations under the new constitution?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I shall ask the Senator a question in a moment if he will be patient with me. The Senator's complaint against the original document is no more strenuous, I repeat, than the complaint of the membership of the committee against the document which reached us, upon which the pending joint resolution is based. After it went through the wringer and came back with all these objectionable matters eliminated, would the Senator from West Virginia say that that process leaves us bound in any fashion whatsoever by the objectionable matter which has been eliminated, or would not the Senator say that the very act of elimination has emphasized the fact that we disagree with the things we eliminated? I suggest that to the Senator from West Virginia, because when I vote for the pending joint resolution I shall vote on the theory that the things that have been eliminated have been eliminated for keeps. And certainly the point the able Senator from West Virginia speaks of would have to be eliminated for keeps, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am quite sure that it would have to be eliminated for keeps so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned. And I will say that this debate and this discussion have clarified the subject very much. Such statements as have been made by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Michigan have revealed to the Senate the important work that was done here. But I go one step further in answer to the Senator's question, and particularly in answer to the second part of it concerning elimination. I am confronted with the fact that representatives of the administration of the United

States Government went into conference, just such a one as will be held under this constitution, and came back here with their names signed to a document recommending the migration feature. I cannot understand it. I cannot condemn it too strongly.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator, if he will let me say so, is also confronted with the fact that the thing he condemns was so totally eliminated that it did not even reappear in the draft which we worked upon in the Foreign Relations Committee, and I submit to the Senator that it is even more persuasive to me as to the attitude of Congress toward the question, that it has been thrown out, plowed under, eliminated, totally rejected. I submit to the Senator that that is even more eloquent a factor of safety than if that had not occurred.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah rose.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Utah in a moment. Let me make this answer. I wish to say to the Senator that the committee did throw out the recommendation—

Mr. AUSTIN. No, no.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It was out before it reached us.

Mr. AUSTIN. We never had a chance to throw it out. It was not in the document which came to us.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Well, it was certainly in it in the year 1943, when the American representatives signed the document containing that recommendation. The fact that Senators here today do not approve of the migration feature does not mean that whoever we designate to represent this country in the organization will not come forth with a similar recommendation. The constitution is not a group of recommendations. It is a provision for recommendations; such recommendations as were contained in the report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not only did the conference which wrote the constitution eliminate all the things to which the Senator objects, but under the constitution itself, if the recommendations should be repeated they could not be included unless the Congress of the United States agreed to them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say, Mr. President, that there is no elimination of that recommendation because the constitution is not a constitution of recommendations. Recommendations are not eliminated. The document from which I have read contains the recommendations that would be had under the constitution if the members saw fit to make them, and the fear which I have, let me say to the Senator—

Mr. BARKLEY. They would not be recommendations unless they were repeated. They may have been recommendations made in 1943. They were not included in the constitution. We are not voting upon the recommendations, and in order for them ever to be voted on they would have to be repeated. We would still have the right to throw them out as they were thrown out by the Or-

ganization before the constitution was written.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course no recommendation is included in the constitution. It is not set up as a recommendation. It is set up and given the power of recommendation just as was attempted in the first instance. The apprehension I have, Mr. President, I repeat, is: Will the representatives of our Government in the Organization do this again under the constitution? There is every reason to believe, since they did it once, that they will, and come back to us with a recommendation of the kind to which I have referred.

Mr. BARKLEY. The representatives may not even be the same individuals, but even if they should make the recommendations they would have no effect unless Congress should adopt them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But it is one step toward putting the recommendation into effect, and in view of the history of the setting up of the Food Conference, under which recommendations were made for migration of people from country to country, I think we are put on notice that we may again be presented with a similar recommendation.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not want to get into an argument about the matter which is now before the Senate. I think the argument stage has passed. But I think it is proper to point out that if there is any force in what the Senator from West Virginia is stating it is by way of confirmation of the constitutional theory of the Government of the United States which is, as I understand, that before any international agreement is entered into there shall be the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States to the agreement.

Mr. President, many of us have always felt that advice and consent were two separate propositions, and that probably a little advice before negotiation would often be a good thing in this Government of ours. It has been pointed out that lately our Government has proceeded along that line, and representatives of this body were sent to the International Labor Conference a year ago last May; representatives of this body were sent to Mexico; representatives of this body were sent to San Francisco.

I agree with the arguments the Senator has made to the extent that I will say it was a mistake that representatives of this body were not also sent to the Virginia conference. I wish to make that statement now because if there has ever been a time in the history of the United States when a document which might be called a treaty has been considered, and considered properly, this is the time. That is proved by the appointment of the subcommittee, the way in which the subcommittee worked, the reporting of the subcommittee's deliberations back to the various nations, the acceptance of the subcommittee's suggestions by the other nations, and finally the constitution itself presented here for consideration, on the recommendation of the subcommittee that it be presented,

not as ordinary treaties are presented, but in such a way that both the House of Representatives and the Senate should act upon it.

I point out that all the safeguards that belonged to the people at the time of founding of our Constitution—that liberty should be maintained by a balance of powers and by checks, as well as every other safeguard—have been observed. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. Austin], former Senator Gillette, and I, in offering suggestions about this constitution, and actually wording many of its provisions, were thinking in terms of the way in which the Constitution of the United States was established.

Mr. President, I am sorry that I have missed the debate. In addition to what I have said, let me say further that, while the Senator from West Virginia has questioned certain things, we also questioned every one of them, as he would have us question them. As a subcommittee, we thought we should question them. It was our duty. When the document was finished, we heartily supported it, as it should be supported, as a necessary thing.

I think we ought to be just, as well as correct, in considering what took place back in 1943. Conditions in the world were very different in 1943 than they are today.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me interrupt the Senator at this point, if I may. What conditions obtaining in 1943 would justify the United States in subscribing to a plan to place in the hands of a world organization the power to cause people to migrate, and command them to migrate, from one country to another?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In 1943 the United States Government was carrying on negotiations with the Mexican Government to bring Mexican laborers into the United States to take care of our crops, and we have Mexican laborers in the United States today. The Senator knows that to be so.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is a purely temporary thing, and it has been going on for years.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It is purely temporary, and it is all done in accordance with the laws of the United States. Nothing will be done under this agreement to interfere with the fundamental laws of the United States or the laws of other countries. But at that very time the people of the world knew that farm laborers and other laborers had been made captive and actually taken from one country to another.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me interrupt again. Under no definition could the transitory labor which has been brought in from Mexico and from some of the West Indies islands to take care of crops in season and moved out later be called settlers. Let me read the language in the recommendations signed by our own representatives at that meeting:

Where emigration is possible, an international organization should support arrangements to provide safeguards for the settlers and for the countries concerned, and to facilitate the movement through other appropriate means.

They were not dealing with the transitory labor from Mexico referred to by the

able Senator. They were dealing with settlers, permanent residents.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, they were dealing with every type of migratory labor known to man. Approximately 40 nations were represented, and each of those nations had a different problem. But never was it suggested, and never could it be suggested, that an international agreement would interfere with the laws of a given nation with regard to migratory labor or settlement. The words which were used—

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am not arguing. I am explaining, because this whole thing is past and done. As was pointed out by the Senator from Vermont—

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has stated that the proposed organization would not invade the laws of any country. I take it the Senator has read the final act of the meeting at Hot Springs, Va., in 1943. Upon reading it, does he not find that an international organization is proposed to be set up to deal with migration intranationally, inside the country, and internationally, from one country to another? If the recommendations were carried out, if the international organization would not have authority to deal with the question, then I do not know how authority could be given to any agency to deal with the migration of people.

Mr. President, we have discussed this question at some length. I believe that further argument is unnecessary. In closing, I wish to point out that in considering this joint resolution and acting upon it, we do so with notice served upon us, not that other countries want an international control of migration of people from one country to another, but that our own administration in this Government and its representatives have approved, at a secret meeting, a recommendation which would place in the hands of the International Organization on Food and Agriculture the power to deal with migration from one country to another including our own.

I submit, Mr. President, that with that notice given to us of the danger, and with the right of recommendation existing in the organization to which we are about to subscribe, I have grave doubts of the wisdom of this country subscribing to such an organization under such notice.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened with very deep interest to the debate which has occurred during the past 2 days upon the so-called food constitution submitted to the Senate for adoption or rejection. I have followed the proposed program from its inception, at the time when the President called the Hot Springs Conference. I think the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has just cause for the apprehension he has expressed about what is behind the proposed constitution. In the constitution itself, so far as its language goes, there is perhaps nothing to be alarmed about; but, Mr. President, from the very beginning there has been a complete pattern of what is behind this movement. I recall very well the circumstances of the Hot Springs Conference.

Representatives of 44 nations were brought here during the war and were housed at Hot Springs, Va. Armed soldiers were stationed around the buildings in which the Conference was housed. Representatives of the newspapers were not permitted to go there. Members of Congress were not there. I do not know whether they would have been thrown out if they had attempted to attend, but they were not there and they were not invited. During the agitation which occurred at that time, as I remember so well, some 15 Senators met in this building, as I remember, at the call of the Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally] to discuss the question whether the United States Senate should be represented at the Conference at Hot Springs. A number of representatives of the State Department were present that day. Some very strong expressions of opinion were made by Senators with reference to the fact that the public, the newspapers, and we were apparently being excluded from any participation or listening in at the Conference. I remember very well that a representative of the State Department, a distinguished gentleman, made this observation before us that day: "If I had anything to do about it, you would be there. But the White House does not want you there."

Mr. President, I do not recite that in order to refer to the White House, but simply to indicate the pattern which was drawn for that Conference and the subsequent things which happened. Following the Conference session, for several months there was what was called an interim commission whose task it was to draw up recommendations and plans for handling the food of the world. It worked all summer. I remember that I made a speech in this Chamber in March 1944, after I had discussed the tentative program with many of those who were interested in it and had received information regarding what they were planning to do. At that time I pointed out, in March 1944, the things we could expect from this Food Conference in the way of recommendations, in the way of treaties, and in the way of proposed legislation. No one paid any attention to it at that time, but I stated in substance that legislation was already in preparation to put over these plans and to control the food of the world and the farmers of the United States.

While the Foreign Relations Committee has stated—I have no reason to doubt it—that those suggestions were thrown out the window, I think the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has ample reason for being apprehensive because of the pattern, the thinking, and the belief of those in the administration who are planning and scheming to have this proposal adopted.

I do not know whether, with the subsequent action of the Congress, the Constitution will perhaps permit that being done. But I am sure the Senate will be interested in some of the thinking of certain persons who are employed in various departments in Washington. I am sure the Senate will be interested in what those persons think with reference to this important subject. I wish every



farmer in the United States knew what are some of the plans.

Yesterday it was stated that the farm organizations, or at least some of them, approved this plan. I doubt very much if the officials who made the recommendation ever read the secret recommendations and plans which have been made for this organization.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to four or five recommendations in this plan. I quote from a report entitled "What Postwar Policies for Agriculture?" and furnished only upon request by the Department of Agriculture in January 1944. I quote from page 3 of that report:

But national policy should not undertake to support in agriculture everyone who may choose to live on a farm, without proper consideration for his contribution to the national welfare.

What does that statement mean? It can mean only one thing. Someone or some agency in Washington is planning and hoping to obtain power in order that it may say to the farmers of the United States, "You do not belong in farming, you cannot make a living in farming, so we will transfer you to another industry or to another trade." Somebody, a super father, if you please, Mr. President, is going to plan our lives for us on the farm. Being intensely interested in agriculture, and representing a farming State, I want the people of my State to know what the officers of this Government are thinking of and planning for them.

I invite now attention to another paragraph under the section entitled "Good Land-Tenure Conditions." It reads as follows:

We believe that private property is a public trust, and that wherever public and private interests in land use conflict the public interest should prevail.

Mr. President, that is an astounding statement. Again some individual, some supergod, if you please, who knows all, thinks all, and does all in Washington, is going to say to the American farmer that the use of his land must be determined by that individual or by that particular public agency, and that in its high opinion it will be important that the use of the land be devoted to purposes which the agency shall select instead of to the purposes which may be selected by the occupant of the land.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wonder if it would not be proper to ask the Senator from South Dakota to suggest just what the American farmer will say in reply to such a demand if it should be made.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not believe I understood the Senator's inquiry.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Inasmuch as the Senator is interpreting what the Department of Agriculture intends to do to our farmers, why should he not interpret the minds of the farmers and say what the farmer will reply in case the suggestion is made to him as stated by the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I do not know what the department would say, but I know

what the average farmer in my State would say.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I know what the average farmer in every State would say.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am glad to hear the Senator say so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think, Mr. President, that when it is assumed that some particular official of the Government will say a certain thing to some farmer, it is proper to carry the assumption a little further and state what the farmer will say in reply.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Utah and I both agree on what the American farmer would and should say.

Mr. President, I wish to read further from the report to which I have referred. On page 7 appears the following:

Experience has demonstrated that for some land private ownership serves no public purpose; these lands should be returned to public ownership.

Mr. President, who is to make that decision? Are we going to give some agency in the Federal Government power completely to disrupt the local taxing and governing units among the farm population of this country? The language which I have read can mean only something of that nature.

Here is another statement which is along the line suggested by my distinguished colleague from West Virginia. From page 8 I read the following:

We are not advocating a regimented mass movement of people from the submarginal areas to newly developed areas. Much of the movement would and should be by gradual and successive infiltration, because a large part of the available good land consists of small tracts located in established agricultural areas. But making new land available is an essential step in the process of stimulating and accommodating the required shift of farm population from submarginal areas—a step often insufficiently provided for in past programs.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from West Virginia to a portion of the program which our representatives are scheming about and thinking about. From page 9 of the report I read the following:

According to the census, we have about 6,000,000 farms in the United States. At least two and one-half millions of these can probably never be made to fit our definition of family farms. Some are part-time farms—their occupants devote only part of their time to farming and receive a substantial share of their income from nonfarm employment. Most of them, however, are occupied by marginal and subsistence farmers and unfortunate people who, as a result of economic pressure or inertia, have to depend for a living almost wholly on the inadequate produce of small or unproductive farms.

Mr. President, I am not quarreling with the opinions or the hopes of the persons who issue this kind of tripe, but I join with the Senator from West Virginia in wondering whether such stuff is going to be handed out under this food constitution to the American people and to the Congress. That is why I am apprehensive. I know, after a year and a half of study of some of the officials of our Government, and from contacts with

them, that many of them have plans of the kind set forth in the language which I have read.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question for information. I made a similar request yesterday, but was not fully answered. I direct my question to the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN].

In article XXI, paragraph 3, of the constitution of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reads as follows:

Upon the receipt by the Interim Commission of 20 notifications of acceptance the Interim Commission shall arrange for this constitution to be signed in a single copy by the diplomatic representatives, duly authorized thereto, of the nations who shall have notified their acceptance, and upon being so signed on behalf of not less than 20 of the nations specified in annex I this constitution shall come into force immediately.

Yesterday I was advised by the majority leader that 23 nations had accepted membership, but I was not advised as to whether the ceremony had been held within the permission of the constitution, and was not advised as to whether it is now in effect. Can the senior Senator from Vermont answer the question?

Mr. AUSTIN. If the Senator from South Dakota will yield, the only answer I can make at this time appears in the report at page 20, in a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, to me, dated March 15, 1945, in which there appears the following:

As matters now stand, the first report of the governments of the United Nations by the Interim Commission on Food and Agriculture, dated August 1, 1944, recommended a constitution for the proposed organization but the constitution cannot come into force until at least 20 nations have signified acceptance. Up to now 18 countries have accepted.

I cannot say whether since that time countries have accepted. I heard the statement by the distinguished leader of the majority, and if it was meant to be specifically correct about the matter, a sufficient number of countries have accepted to bring the Organization into being, that is, 23; but I know nothing of it of my own knowledge except what appears in the report.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the majority leader did not say that the steps had been taken. He merely said 23 member nations had accepted, and I call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to a statement on page 19 of the report, in which Dean Acheson, Assistant Secretary of State, under date of March 13, commented in this language:

Inasmuch as 18 countries have already accepted, including the United Kingdom and China, it would appear reasonable to believe that the Organization can and will come into being very quickly after acceptance by the United States.

So I think they contemplated that it would not come into being until after the acceptance by the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; possibly.

Mr. BURTON. It would appear, therefore, that if the senior Senator from Kentucky yesterday made a correct statement when he said that 23 had accepted, the constitution is in a position

to be put into effect immediately, if it has not already gone into effect.

Mr. AUSTIN. I think so.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I should like to direct a question to the senior Senator from Vermont for the purpose of getting some information. On page 5 of the report, in article XVII, we find this language:

Any question or dispute concerning the interpretation of this constitution or any international convention adopted thereunder shall be referred for determination to an appropriate international court or arbitral tribunal in the manner prescribed by rules to be adopted by the Conference.

What would be an appropriate international court?

Mr. AUSTIN. After the organization of the United Nations, under the charter which we are about to consider next week, the court set up under that document would be the appropriate court.

Mr. WILLIS. This anticipates the completion of action on the charter and its going into effect.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. This whole movement is articulated with the effort for a United Nations Organization, and it is one of the organizations referred to in the charter.

Mr. WILLIS. Assuming the United States were involved in a dispute, would it be bound by the interpretation of the International Court?

Mr. AUSTIN. If the United States consented to the jurisdiction of the court it would be.

Mr. WILLIS. We agree in this instrument, do we not, that we will accept such jurisdiction?

Mr. AUSTIN. No. The charter provides only for a judicial tribunal the jurisdiction of which is not compulsory unless the option provided in the charter is exercised.

Mr. WILLIS. The language here is, "Any question of dispute concerning interpretation shall be referred for determination to an appropriate international court."

Mr. AUSTIN. Of course, this is in line with the efforts of all civilized and peace-loving nations to adopt peaceable methods of settlement of controversies among nations, instead of resorting to war.

Mr. WILLIS. Then, under that theory, we would be bound to accept, if we wanted to cooperate with this international program?

Mr. AUSTIN. No; we first would have to be a party to a reference to an appropriate tribunal, and we would be bound if we agreed to be bound by it. There is nothing in this provision which binds the United States in advance to the jurisdiction of any specific tribunal.

Mr. WILLIS. It seems to me the language states clearly that we shall be bound if we subscribe to this agreement.

Mr. AUSTIN. It binds the United States to do just what it says.

Mr. WILLIS. To refer the controversy to the court.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes; "any question of dispute concerning the interpretation of this constitution or any international convention adopted thereunder."

Mr. WILLIS. If we wanted to continue to cooperate in the organization

we probably would have to accept the finding, would we not?

Mr. AUSTIN. There is nothing in the constitution which says so, but the moral responsibility of this country would cause us to be bound. We would never refer questions to an arbitral tribunal and then repudiate the decision, and we are saying to the world by this article XVII that we are not only subscribing to the idea of peaceful settlement of disputes but we are advocating it and we are leading in that direction.

Mr. WILLIS. I agree with that doctrine, but in a dispute which might arise a decision might be rendered by a super court by which we did not wish to abide. How could be honorably withdraw?

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the Senator answer a question by me?

Mr. WILLIS. I shall try to.

Mr. AUSTIN. How would the Senator suggest that this be changed?

Mr. WILLIS. I would suggest that the article be eliminated and the clarification of disputes could be made by amendments as provided elsewhere, which amendments would be subject to the approval of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. AUSTIN. Then, if we had a disagreement with Great Britain respecting interpretation of this constitution, or a treaty made under it, the Senator would want to have both countries go to a determination of that issue by war?

Mr. WILLIS. Oh, no; I do not think that is involved.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is just what it involves. It involves a promise to use other means than war for the interpretation of this constitution and treaties made thereunder. That is what it means.

Mr. WILLIS. I would say to the Senator, then, that if failure to respect the provisions of this article might lead us to war, or cause us to invoke the veto right of the charter, it is of such a serious nature that I certainly think the article should be withdrawn and the United States permitted to decide for itself, on such an occasion, as to whether it wanted to be bound by the interpretation of a court.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is exactly what leads to war, when a country is so nationalistic that it will not agree to submit questions of interpretation as between itself and its vis-à-vis in a contract to a tribunal to pass upon them, that is what leads to war. If each country party to such a controversy insists that it alone shall pass upon its interpretation, we will never arrive at a peaceable settlement of a dispute. Each country simply adheres to its interpretation.

Mr. WILLIS. It seems to me that then we are committing ourselves to a much more serious obligation than has been heretofore represented in connection with this matter.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; there has been no representation excepting the constitution itself with respect to the constitution, and I took great care earlier today to have it printed in the debate, so that such a claim as that made by the Senator from Indiana could not confront me later. It has confronted me now within a few moments, but the RECORD shows that I in-

serted the text of the constitution in the RECORD, so that the entire statement as found in the constitution would be my representation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont whether we could be brought into a court of the type he describes without our agreement on the reference?

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, my answer would be "No."

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me so that I may also direct a question to the senior Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. Bearing on the same question I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont this question: As I understand article XVII, it does not relate to the reference of a dispute in which a judgment is to be rendered for or against the parties to the dispute; it has to do with the reference to a court of a request for an interpretation. This is all it amounts to, that here we have the constitution, and if we wish an interpretation of what it means, we then ask a particular court what it means, and there is where the article stops.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is my understanding.

Mr. WILLIS. But under that interpretation we are binding ourselves to accept some other interpretation that we have not here considered.

Mr. BURTON. As I see it, this, first of all, does not bind the United States to the jurisdiction of any international court for the settlement of a dispute or an adjudication, but it does bind the United States, as I would see it, as a party to this constitution, that if we are in doubt, or somebody else is in doubt as to what it means, we have agreed that the question may be referred to a particular international court for an interpretation, and then, as the senior Senator from Vermont has said, it would rest upon our good faith as to whether or not we would accept the interpretation.

Mr. WILLIS. That decision would come later. It might be an interpretation different from that we now construe.

I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont another question, perhaps a minor one. We find that the amount which the United States is to subscribe to this organization is 25 percent of the total amount, and that has been interpreted to be, I think, about \$1,250,000 for a full year. Under what formula was that amount determined? This applies also to other organizations of a similar character. What formulas have been used in determining the amount for which we are committed?

Mr. AUSTIN. I do not know under what formula it was determined. I can only guess that the economic resources of the various members, their population, their interests, and such factors were taken into consideration by the Interim Conference in arriving at the various ratios which appear on page 7 of the report. By contrast, the dis-



tinguished Senator will notice that as against the 25 percent for the United States the United Kingdom has 15 percent, and as against 25 percent for the United States Uruguay has less than 1 percent; that is, fifty-eight one hundredths of a percent. And so it goes. The table before us is not arbitrary and is not binding forever and ever. The provision of the constitution relating to a budget enables the organization to adapt itself to any changing situation.

Mr. WILLIS. I will say to the Senator that I have never been able to find anyone who could explain the formula under which the United States is being asked to pay a much greater sum than other nations in this organization are asked to pay. The United Kingdom would provide 15 percent. The United Kingdom has a much greater area, has a much larger population, and probably has much greater natural resources than the United States.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is set down for 8 percent.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is the Senator addressing those remarks to me? If so I should like to reply that I think he is in error about the United Kingdom with respect to—

Mr. WILLIS. The United Kingdom is set down for 15 percent.

Mr. AUSTIN. No; that is not what I mean. I meant to speak of area. The reference is not to the entire British Commonwealth of Nations.

Mr. WILLIS. Then the sums are probably a fair comparable amount.

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. WILLIS. Russia is to pay 8 percent. Russia has vastly greater agricultural areas than we have, has a vastly greater population, and much greater natural resources. I understand Russia does not have one dollar of national debt, whereas the United States will have a national debt of approximately \$300,000,000,000. It seems to me that those who set up these formulae are not properly protecting the future welfare of the United States.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to add to the discussion that the technique used and followed here is the same as has been used in apportioning the expenses among the nations of the world since the institution of the International Postal Union. There is no difference between them. If we go through the list we may discover some arbitrary spots here and there. Perhaps some nation is paying a little more than it should pay. But the scheme has worked very well since the establishment of the International Postal Union, and I think it will continue to work. I think we sometimes make comparisons without adding up all the factors involved. Some may assume that we are paying more than our share, but when we consider the matter of agricultural production and other production, as well as what we will gain from cooperation, I believe we will find the apportionment to be fair.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a

question. He was answering a question directed to him by the Senator from Indiana and making an explanation of the difference in the percentage of the support which is requested from the United States to the organization under discussion now, and from other nations who are represented. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the list of nations who belong to UNRRA. During the last few days the Byrd committee has been holding hearings in connection with our contribution to the support of the program conducted under UNRRA. I have compared the nations on the UNRRA list with the nations listed in the bill under consideration. They are exactly the same. There are 44 of them, beginning with Australia and ending with Yugoslavia. The division of the expense in the support of UNRRA is based on some formula. In that case the United States contributes \$1,350,000,000, or 72 percent of the total. In the case of the bill under consideration, for some reason the percentage allotted to the United States is 25 percent, if the figures given by the Senator from Indiana are correct.

I should like to know why that difference exists. If the United States is able to support only 25 percent of the program of the bill under consideration, how can the United States expect to support 72 percent of the program for UNRRA, in which exactly the same nations are included?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have no more answer to that question than the Senator from Nebraska has, except to say that the factors are very different, and the facts connected with the two organizations are very different.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock has now arrived. Under the unanimous-consent agreement heretofore adopted debate on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto is ended.

The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 145) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1851. An act for the relief of the widow and three children of Greenfield Payne;

H. R. 2032. An act authorizing general shore-line investigations at Federal expense, and to repeal an act for the improvement and protection of the beaches along the shores of the United States, approved June 26, 1936; and

H. R. 2699. An act for the relief of Dr. Jabez Fenton Jackson and Mrs. Narcissa Wilmans Jackson.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1270. An act relating to the payment of subsidies by the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and

H. R. 3771. An act to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes.

#### CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 68, providing for an adjournment for a certain period of the two Houses of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 68, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring).* That when the House adjourns on Saturday, July 21, 1945, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, October 8, 1945, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 2. That the consent of the House of Representatives is hereby given to an adjournment of the Senate at any time during the month of August or September 1945, until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, October 8, 1945, or until 12 o'clock meridian on the third day after Members are notified to reassemble in accordance with section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

Sec. 3. The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever in their opinion legislative expediency shall warrant it or whenever the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House, acting jointly, or the minority leader of the Senate and the minority leader of the House acting jointly, file a written request with the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House that the Congress reassemble for the consideration of legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement.

The House originally contemplated providing for an adjournment of the House, with the consent of the Senate, until the first day of October. In view of the fact that we are to take up the San Francisco Charter on Monday, and in view of the fact that our ability to take a recess will be postponed for some days following the adjournment of the House, the House agreed to provide for the reconvening of the two Houses on the 8th of October instead of the 1st.

The concurrent resolution provides in advance the consent of the House to an adjournment of the Senate at any time during the month of August or the month of September. We may conclude consideration of the charter before the 1st of August. I hope we may; but I do not wish to suggest any amendment to the concurrent resolution. If we conclude consideration of the charter prior to the 1st of August, a sufficient number of us will be present to have a session on that day so as to comply with the terms of the

concurrent resolution, which provides for an adjournment of the Senate at any time during August or September. If we conclude consideration of the treaty prior to the first day of August, we can have a session on that day and provide then, by suitable motion, for the adjournment of the Senate until the 8th of October, when, under the terms of the concurrent resolution, the two Houses will reconvene.

I ask for a vote on the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) was agreed to.

#### COVERAGE OF CERTAIN DRUGS UNDER THE FEDERAL NARCOTIC LAWS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 183, House bill 2348, to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2348) to provide for the coverage of certain drugs under the Federal narcotic laws.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate, I can explain the bill in a very few words.

The bill would give to the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to determine whether any synthetic drug possesses the qualities of morphine or cocaine. Heretofore the Congress has dealt with problems of this kind by special legislation, whenever a synthetic drug, habit-forming or habit-sustaining, has appeared. In the Seventy-eighth Congress, under Public Law 414, Congress dealt with a specific derivative of one of the drugs, or a synthetic duplication of a particular drug. This bill proposes a general law, so that the Secretary of the Treasury may, at any time when a synthetic drug which possesses habit-forming or habit-sustaining qualities appears, determine whether or not it shall receive the same treatment as morphine or cocaine, that is, whether or not it shall be brought under the same regulations and control.

The word "opiate" has been selected as a generic term. In the event of any habit-forming drug making its appearance, it will be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury whether the drug possesses the same qualities as either morphine or cocaine. If so, it may be brought under the same regulation as morphine or cocaine.

The bill provides for ample notice and hearing to any party interested in the production or distribution of the drug before any order is entered. The hearing will be public. The parties will have an opportunity to appear and make their case; and thereafter the Department will determine whether the drug is a habit-

forming or habit-sustaining drug within the meaning of the act. If the finding is affirmative, then no order can be issued by the Secretary, but the President of the United States to whom the matter is referred, may himself issue the order. It is precisely what has been done in the case of certain synthetic drugs which possess all the qualities and have all the habit-forming or habit-sustaining characteristics of the natural drug itself. This is simply a bill which brings under observation the whole field of synthetic drugs falling in that category.

It is represented to the committee that need for the bill actually exists. Information in the Narcotics Division of the Treasury indicates that the conclusions reached by the Secretary in presenting this bill are very well founded.

It is believed that if the proposed law is made general and applicable to all of the opiates—which, as I have already explained, is a generic term—then before any considerable quantity of any habit-forming drug, synthetic in character, can be placed on the market and go into consumption, proper steps can be taken to regulate and control it. That is the whole purpose of the bill. It is a long bill, but the various sections are intended to apply the generic term "opium" to various sections of our narcotic laws and even to our tariff laws and tax laws.

I am bringing up the bill at this time. It has passed the House of Representatives. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] presented to the Finance Committee a matter in which several of the States of the Union are interested, and a hearing was had by the Senator from Wisconsin. The committee has given to the Senator from Wisconsin the privilege of presenting as a committee amendment an amendment which he desires to offer to the bill. I now yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

#### AMENDMENTS RELATING TO MARIHUANA

SEC. 10. (a) Exemption for certain transfers to millers: Section 2591 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e) Exemption for certain transfers to millers: Nothing in this section shall apply to a transfer of the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. or any parts thereof from any person registered under section 3231 to a person who is also registered under section 3231 as a taxpayer required to pay the tax imposed by section 3230 (a) (6)."

(b) Special tax on millers: Section 3230 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) a new subdivision (6) to read as follows:

"(6) Millers: Any person who at a mill manufactures or produces from the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. any fiber or fiber products, \$1 per year or fraction thereof during which he engages in such activities."

(c) Registration of millers: Section 3231 of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by inserting at the beginning thereof, before the word "any" the following: "(a) In general.—"; and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection to read as follows:

"(b) Special requirements for millers: The Secretary shall not permit the registration of any person under this section as a person required to pay the tax imposed by section 3230 (a) (6), unless in the opinion of the Secretary such person (if a corporation, each officer thereof) is a person of good moral character and unless in the opinion of the Secretary such person is a person of suitable financial standing, intends to engage in good faith in the business of manufacturing or producing fiber or fiber products from the plant *Cannabis sativa* L. on a commercial basis, and is not seeking registration under this section for the purpose of facilitating the unlawful diversion of marihuana. Any person who is registered under this section and has paid the tax imposed by section 3230 (a) (6) shall afford agents of the Bureau of Narcotics ready access at all times to any part of the premises of the mill or other premises of such person and the right to inspect any and all books, papers, records, or documents connected with the activities of such person in dealing in, manufacturing, and processing *Cannabis sativa* L. and fiber or fiber products thereof, and the handling of marihuana. The Secretary may cancel or may refuse to renew, after notice and opportunity for hearing, the registration of any such person if he finds that such person has not complied or is not complying with the requirements of this subsection, or if he finds that grounds exist which would justify the refusal to permit the original registration of such person under this section."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement for the RECORD in support of this amendment, which was authorized by the Finance Committee to be offered to the bill, as has been stated by the able chairman of the committee.

Mr. President, hemp has been produced in the United States since earliest colonial times. In World War I and again in World War II the expansion of the production of hemp became vitally necessary to the war effort. Between the two wars privately operated commercial scutching mills carried on their activity in peacetime. Then, when our source of supply from the Orient, and especially from the Philippines, was cut off in the World War, it became necessary for the Government to enter upon an extensive program designed to enlarge production. A number of plants were built in several of the States of the Union. Approximately \$12,000,000 was invested by the Government in the construction of those scutching mills in order to increase the production of hemp essential to the war effort, and especially in order to provide the necessary rope for the tremendously expanded naval program.

In 1937 the Congress passed the so-called Marihuana Act, giving the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department and the Treasury Department itself power to control the traffic in marihuana. Representatives of the hemp industry appeared at the time the hearing was held before the Finance Committee, and Mr. Hester, who then was with the Treasury Department as assistant general counsel, was asked by Senator Brown, of Michigan, who then was chairman of the subcommittee considering the legislation, whether enactment of the bill would in anywise interfere with the legitimate commercial production of hemp.



Mr. Hester made this statement:

The production and sale of hemp and its products for industrial purposes will not be adversely affected by this bill—

Referring to the Marihuana Act, then under consideration. He further said:

In general, the term "marihuana" is defined in the bill so as to include only the flowering tops, leaves, and seeds of the hemp plant and to exclude the mature stalk, oil, and meal obtained from the seeds of the plant, and sterilized seed, incapable of germination.

A similar statement was made by Commissioner Anslinger.

However, early in March of this year one of the district supervisors sent out letters to some of the operators of the scutching mills which indicated that the Bureau of Narcotics was about to change its interpretations of the regulations. The result was that the operators of the mills felt that they could not carry on their production, because of the terrific liability for taxes, in many instances running into many million dollars, which they might incur if the letter of the Bureau of Narcotics were carried out to its full extent.

This raised the question whether it was necessary to enact some new legislation which would make it possible for this not large but very essential industry to move forward.

As a result, as has been stated by the Senator from Georgia, we had a hearing before the Finance Committee, at which appeared representatives of the Department of Agriculture, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the producers of hemp, and a representative of the Bureau of Narcotics. It became perfectly clear from that testimony that it would be impossible for the industry to be carried on if the interpretation which had been placed upon the Marihuana Act in March were allowed to stand.

Following the hearing I consulted with several Senators who represent States in which hemp is produced. I also conferred with the operators of private mills, as well as with officials in the Department of Agriculture who are interested indirectly in the industry. As a result, this amendment was worked out. I believe that Senators will observe that it is a very drastic power which we are giving to the Secretary of the Treasury in determining, in his discretion, and in the first instance, whether those who are licensed to operate mills are of good moral character, and whether they have sufficient capital to indicate that they are going into the business in good faith.

I may say that these mills cost the Government an average of about \$300,000 each. So obviously, any person engaging in this business has a substantial stake in it. Under the amendment the Secretary of the Treasury is not only given power to pass upon the question of moral character and financial standing of every officer of every company which is to be licensed, but he also has the right to direct that the license be cancelled, or refuse to renew it, after an opportunity has been given for a hearing, he determines that the person is not complying with the requirements of the subsection of the act, or if he finds that sufficient

ground exists to justify him in refusing the original registration of a person under the subsection.

So, Mr. President, I think I may say, without any question, that we are giving a power to the Secretary which certainly will prevent the possibility of any hemp which is produced by licensees under this amendment, if it becomes the law, directly or indirectly becoming a contributing factor in the use or traffic of the marihuana drug.

I may also state, Mr. President, that I do not believe there is any evidence of a substantial character that any of the persons who have engaged in this legitimate industry have been the source of illicit traffic in marihuana. As a matter of fact marihuana grows wild in many sections of the country. Any Senator from the Middle West, or any Senator who has lived in the Middle West along the rights-of-way of railroads, and who is able to recognize the plant when he sees it, knows that it grows in profusion as a weed.

I feel that it is important for the country to preserve the hemp industry. I am sure the Finance Committee was impressed with the importance of preserving the industry. I believe we have worked out an amendment which will not in any way weaken the power and control of the Bureau of Narcotics over traffic in marihuana, and at the same time I believe that the amendment, if it becomes law, will enable the legitimate producers of hemp to carry on their activities.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I recall the discussions which were had some time ago with respect to the regulation of the use of marihuana and hemp, there was either a regulation, or one was being proposed at that time, which would prevent the transportation of the plant unless 90 percent of its leaves had been removed. That would make it prohibitive to transport hemp from where it is grown to the factory. In the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin, has that situation been adequately provided for in this amendment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I believe that if the amendment becomes law no such regulation could be issued. I may say that a letter which emanated from one of the district supervisors stated that the Department would not permit any foliage to remain on the hemp. When hemp is cut it is permitted to lie in the field until the moisture has produced a sufficient amount of bacteria to eat the binder out of the hemp, and prepare it for the scutching mills where it can be shredded, and the fiber separated from it. In that process many of the leaves fall off. It would not be possible, either under the 90-percent provision or the 100-percent provision, should there be no foliage on the plant when it left the field, for the industry to operate. We have drafted the amendment in such a way that I am certain that situation has been cured.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The process could take place in two places. It could take place in the field where the hemp is cut, or the hemp could be transported

under certain conditions from the field to the factory where it would be placed in piles or stacks, and permitted to go through a certain phase of the retting process.

In the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin, would this amendment prevent the issuance of arbitrary regulations which would in effect kill the industry by preventing the transportation of the partly green hemp with the foliage on it from the field where it is grown and cut to, for example, the mill site where it would go through the final retting process? In other words, if such transportation is to be prevented later by regulation, the industry will be killed whether the amendment is agreed to or not.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I believe that situation is taken care of by the amendment. As I have stated before, we have given very drastic discretionary power to the Secretary, so far as those who are engaged in the business are concerned, in granting them licenses. I think we have eliminated the danger of any regulation being issued which would interfere with the normal historical commercial production processes so far as hemp is concerned. Yet, by granting power with relation to the issuance of licenses, we have prevented the growing of hemp which is to be used as marihuana.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is correct. The licensing of the miller or the processor, and the broad powers which it is being proposed to give to the Secretary for the purpose of regulating the miller or the processor, are perfectly proper provided the gap between the processor and the producer is not an insurmountable one in its relation to the transportation end of the industry. As I recall, that was the serious situation which arose this spring. The processor was compelled to process, and the farmer was compelled to grow retting hemp on his premises, but the Department said that if 90 percent of the foliage was not off the hemp, it could not be transported from the place where it was grown to the mill. I am only concerned that the Senator has been assured by the Department that its attitude will not result in prohibitive regulations of the kind to which I have referred being adopted. I want to be sure that the amendment is sufficiently protective under the powers to be granted to the Secretary.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I can say to the Senator from Iowa that I am satisfied that this amendment takes care of the situation with regard to the transfer of the retting hemp, or the hemp from the field to the mill, and the millers are satisfied that they can operate under this provision if it becomes law.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Wisconsin has been concerned with this matter for some time, and if he is satisfied with the provisions I am happy to know it, and I am certainly willing to go along, because I shall be satisfied, too.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate the interest which the Senators from Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, and Kentucky have taken in this matter.

I wish to close with the statement that the Department acquiesces in the enactment of the amendment, and especially

since the Finance Committee has determined that it believes that the industry should be preserved.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I noticed that in enumerating the States the Senator left out North Dakota. I want the Senator to know that we also have a law in North Dakota prohibiting traffic in marihuana, that it grows wild, as the Senator has said, and that both Senators from North Dakota have been very much interested in the enactment of the proposed legislation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I beg the Senator's pardon for not having included the State of the Senators from North Dakota.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator about the powers under the act. At the present time there is an extensive hemp processing industry built up largely by Government-subsidized or Government-built plants. Those plants in the main are operated by private corporations, but they are really Government-constructed plants. What effect will the amendment have upon the ability of purely private individuals to build their own plants, install their own machinery, and contract for hemp acreage and processing of hemp?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The amendment will have no effect on them if they can get licenses from the Secretary.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, they will be in the same category with the operators of the present Government-owned or Government-controlled plants?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Any mills which may now be privately owned or operated or publicly owned or operated will all have to get licenses from the Secretary, under the same provisions. So it will have no effect upon the competitive situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have inserted as a part of my remarks a memorandum prepared by Mr. Charles Murphy, of the legislative counsel's office, showing changes made in existing law by the proposed amendment now under consideration.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### MEMORANDUM SHOWING CHANGES MADE IN EXISTING LAW BY PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

(Existing provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to marihuana are shown in roman type. The matter proposed to be inserted by the amendments is printed in italic.)

#### SUBCHAPTER C—MARIHUANA

##### SEC. 2590. Tax.

(a) Rate: There shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all transfers of marihuana which are required by section 2591 to be carried out in pursuance of written order forms taxes at the following rates:

(1) Transfers to special taxpayers: Upon each transfer to any person who has paid the special tax and registered under sections 3230 and 3231, \$1 per ounce of marihuana or fraction thereof.

(2) Transfers to others: Upon each transfer to any person who has not paid the special tax and registered under sections 3230 and 3231, \$100 per ounce of marihuana or fraction thereof.

(b) By whom paid: Such tax shall be paid by the transferee at the time of securing each order form and shall be in addition to the price of such form. Such transferee shall be liable for the tax imposed by this section but in the event that the transfer is made in violation of section 2591 without an order form and without payment of the transfer tax imposed by this section, the transferor shall also be liable for such tax.

##### (c) How paid:

(1) Stamps: Payment of the tax herein provided shall be represented by appropriate stamps to be provided by the Secretary.

##### (2) Assessment:

For assessment in case of omitted taxes payable by stamp, see section 3311 and section 3640.

##### (d) Registration and special tax:

For requirements as to registration and special tax, see part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27.

##### SEC. 2591. Order forms.

(a) General requirement: It shall be unlawful for any person, whether or not required to pay a special tax and register under sections 3230 and 3231, to transfer marihuana, except in pursuance of a written order of the person to whom such marihuana is transferred, on a form to be issued in blank for that purpose by the Secretary.

(b) Exceptions: Subject to such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, nothing contained in this section shall apply—

(1) Professional practice: To a transfer of marihuana to a patient by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 3231, in the course of his professional practice only; *Provided*, That such physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner shall keep a record of all such marihuana transferred, showing the amount transferred and the name and address of the patient to whom such marihuana is transferred, and such record shall be kept for a period of 2 years from the date of the transfer of such marihuana, and subject to inspection as provided in section 2595.

(2) Prescription: To a transfer of marihuana, made in good faith by a dealer to a consumer under and in pursuance of a written prescription issued by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 3231: *Provided further*, That such prescription shall be dated as of the date on which signed and shall be signed by the physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner who issue the same: *Provided further*, That such dealer shall preserve such prescription for a period of 2 years from the date on which such prescription is filled so as to be readily accessible for inspection by the officers, agents, employees, and officials mentioned in section 2595.

(3) Exportation: To the sale, exportation, shipment, or delivery of marihuana by any person within the United States, any Territory, the District of Columbia, or any of the insular possessions of the United States, to any person in any foreign country regulating the entry of marihuana, if such sale, shipment, or delivery of marihuana is made in accordance with such regulations for importation into such foreign country as are prescribed by such foreign country, such regulations to be promulgated from time to time by the Secretary of State of the United States.

(4) Government and State officials: To a transfer of marihuana to any officer or employee of the United States Government or of any State, Territorial, District, county, or municipal or insular government lawfully engaged in making purchases thereof for the various departments of the Army and Navy, the Public Health Service, and for Govern-

ment, State, Territorial, District, county, or municipal or insular hospitals or prisons.

(5) Certain seeds: To a transfer of any seeds of the plant *Cannabis sativa L.* to any person registered under section 3231.

(c) Supply: The Secretary shall cause suitable forms to be prepared for the purposes before mentioned and shall cause them to be distributed to collectors for sale. The price at which such forms shall be sold by said collectors shall be fixed by the Secretary, but shall not exceed 2 cents each. Whenever any collector shall sell any of such forms he shall cause the date of sale, the name and address of the proposed vendor, the name and address of the purchaser, and the amount of marihuana ordered to be plainly written or stamped thereon before delivering the same.

(d) Preservation: Each such order form sold by a collector shall be prepared by him and shall include an original and two copies, any one of which shall be admissible in evidence as an original. The original and one copy shall be given by the collector to the purchaser thereof. The original shall in turn be given by the purchaser thereof to any person who shall, in pursuance thereof, transfer marihuana to him and shall be preserved by such person for a period of 2 years so as to be readily accessible for inspection by any officer, agent, or employee mentioned in section 2595. The copy given to the purchaser by the collector shall be retained by the purchaser and preserved for a period of 2 years so as to be readily accessible to inspection by any officer, agent, or employee mentioned in section 2595. The second copy shall be preserved in the records of the collector.

(e) Exemption for certain transfers to millers: *Nothing in this section shall apply to a transfer of the plant Cannabis sativa L. or any parts thereof from any person registered under section 3231 to a person who is also registered under section 3231 as a taxpayer required to pay the tax imposed by section 3230 (a) (6).*

##### SEC. 2592. Stamps.

(a) Affixing: The stamps provided in section 2590 (c) (1) shall be affixed by the collector or his representative to the original order form.

(b) Other laws applicable: All provisions of law relating to the engraving, issuance, sale, accountability, cancellation, and destruction of tax-paid stamps provided for in the internal-revenue laws shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with this subchapter, be extended and made to apply to stamps provided for in section 2590 (c) (1).

##### (c) Cross reference:

For general provisions relating to stamps, see part I of subchapter A of chapter 28.

##### SEC. 2593. Unlawful possession.

(a) Persons in general: It shall be unlawful for any person who is a transferee required to pay the transfer tax imposed by section 2590 (a) to require or otherwise obtain any marihuana without having paid such tax; and proof that any person shall have had in his possession any marihuana and shall have failed, after reasonable notice and demand by the collector, to produce the order form required by section 2591 to be retained by him, shall be presumptive evidence of guilt under this section and of liability for the tax imposed by section 2590 (a).

(b) Government and State officials: No liability shall be imposed by virtue of this section upon any duly authorized officer of the Treasury Department engaged in the enforcement of this subchapter and part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 or upon any duly authorized officer of any State, or Territory, or of any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or of any insular possession of the United States, who shall be engaged in the enforcement of any law or municipal ordinance dealing with the pro-



duction, sale, prescribing, dispensing, dealing in, or distributing of marihuana.

Sec. 2594. Records, statements, and returns.

(a) General requirement: Every person liable to any tax imposed by this subchapter or part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 shall keep such books and records, render under oath such statements, make such returns, and comply with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may from time to time prescribe.

(b) Return by registrants of marihuana:

For returns by registrants of marihuana, see section 3233 (a) of chapter 27.

Sec. 2595. Inspection of returns, order forms, and prescriptions.

The order forms and copies thereof and the prescriptions and records required to be preserved under the provisions of section 2591, and the statements or returns filed in the office of the collector of the district under the provisions of section 3233 shall be open to inspection by officers, agents, and employees of the Treasury Department duly authorized for that purpose, and such officers of any State, or Territory, or of any political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or of any insular possession of the United States as shall be charged with the enforcement of any law or municipal ordinance regulating the production, sale, prescribing, dispensing, dealing in, or distributing of marihuana. Each collector shall be authorized to furnish, upon written request, copies of any of the said statements or returns filed in his office to any of such officials of any State or Territory, or political subdivision thereof, or the District of Columbia, or any insular possession of the United States as shall be entitled to inspect the said statements or returns filed in the office of the said collector, upon the payment of a fee of \$1 for each 100 words or fraction thereof in the copy or copies so requested.

Sec. 2596. Penalties.

Any person who is convicted of a violation of any provision of this subchapter or part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 shall be fined not more than \$2,000 or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

Sec. 2597. Burden of proof.

It shall not be necessary to negative any exemptions set forth in this subchapter or part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 in any complaint, information, indictment, or other writ or proceeding laid or brought under this subchapter or part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 and the burden of proof of any such exemption shall be upon the defendant. In the absence of the production of evidence by the defendant that he has complied with the provisions of section 3231 relating to registration or that he has complied with the provisions of section 2591 relating to order forms, he shall be presumed not to have complied with such provisions of such sections, as the case may be.

Sec. 2598. Forfeitures.

(a) Unlawful importation, manufacture, or transfer: Any marihuana which has been imported, manufactured, compounded, transferred, or produced in violation of any of the provisions of this subchapter or part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 shall be subject to seizure and forfeiture and, except as inconsistent with the provisions of such subchapter and part, all the provisions of internal-revenue laws relating to searches, seizures, and forfeitures are extended to include marihuana.

(b) Owners and by violators: Any marihuana which may be seized by the United States Government from any person or persons charged with any violation of this subchapter or part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 shall upon conviction of the person or persons from whom seized be confiscated by and forfeited to the United States.

(c) Unknown ownership: Any marihuana seized or coming into the possession of the United States in the enforcement of this sub-

chapter or part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27, the owner or owners of which are unknown, shall be confiscated by and forfeited to the United States.

(d) Disposal: The Secretary is hereby directed to destroy any marihuana confiscated by and forfeited to the United States under this section or to deliver such marihuana to any department, bureau, or other agency of the United States Government, upon proper application therefor under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary.

Sec. 2599. Regulations.

The Secretary is authorized to make, prescribe, and publish all necessary rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of this subchapter and part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27.

Sec. 2600. Delegation of powers.

The Secretary is authorized to confer or impose any of the rights, privileges, powers, and duties conferred or imposed upon him by this subchapter or part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 upon such officers or employees of the Treasury Department as he shall designate or appoint.

Sec. 2601. Other laws applicable.

All provisions of law (including penalties) applicable in respect of the taxes imposed by section 2550 of this chapter and section 3220 of chapter 27, shall, insofar as not inconsistent with this subchapter and part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27, be applicable in respect of the taxes imposed by such subchapter and part.

Sec. 2602. Territorial extent of law.

The provisions of this subchapter and part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 shall apply to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Territory of Alaska, the Territory of Hawaii, and the insular possessions of the United States, except the Philippine Islands.

Sec. 2603. Administration in insular possessions.

(a) Puerto Rico: In Puerto Rico the administration of this subchapter and part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27, the collection of the special taxes and transfer taxes, and the issuance of the order forms provided for in section 2591 shall be performed by the appropriate internal-revenue officers of that government, and all revenues collected under this subchapter and part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 in Puerto Rico shall accrue intact to the general government thereof.

(b) Virgin Islands: The President shall be authorized and directed to issue such Executive orders as will carry into effect in the Virgin Islands the intent and purposes of this subchapter and part VI of subchapter A of chapter 27 by providing for the registration with appropriate officers and the imposition of the special and transfer taxes upon all persons in the Virgin Islands who import, manufacture, produce, compound, sell, deal in, dispense, prescribe, administer, or give away marihuana.

Sec. 2604. Definitions.

For definitions of the following, see the subsections of section 3238 indicated below:

Person: Subsection (a).

Producer: Subsection (c).

Marihuana: Subsection (b).

Transfer or transferred: Subsection (d).

#### PART VI—MARIHUANA

Sec. 3230. Tax.

(a) Liability and time for payment of tax: Every person who imports, manufactures, produces, compounds, sells, deals in, dispenses, prescribes, administers, or gives away marihuana shall (1) before engaging in any of the above-mentioned activities, and (2) thereafter, on or before July 1 of each year, pay the following special taxes respectively:

(1) Importers, manufacturers, and compounders: Importers, manufacturers, and compounders of marihuana, \$24 per year.

(2) Producers: Producers of marihuana (except those included within subdivision (4) of this subsection), \$1 per year, or fraction thereof, during which they engage in such activity.

(3) Physicians, dentists, veterinary surgeons, and other practitioners: Physicians, dentists, veterinary surgeons, and other practitioners who distribute, dispense, give away, administer, or prescribe marihuana to patients upon whom they in the course of their professional practice are in attendance, \$1 per year or fraction thereof during which they engage in any of such activities.

(4) Persons engaged in research, instruction, or analysis: Any person not registered as an importer, manufacturer, producer, or compounder who obtains and uses marihuana in a laboratory for the purpose of research, instruction, or analysis, or who produces marihuana for any such purpose, \$1 per year, or fraction thereof, during which he engages in such activities.

(5) Persons not otherwise taxed.—Any person who is not a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner and who deals in, dispenses, or gives away marihuana, \$3 per year: *Provided*, That any person who has registered and paid the special tax as an importer, manufacturer, compounder, or producer, as required by subdivisions (1) and (2) of this subsection, may deal in, dispense, or give away marihuana imported, manufactured, compounded, or produced by him without further payment of the tax imposed by this section.

(6) Millers: Any person who at a mill manufactures or produces from the plant *Cannabis sativa L.* any fiber or fiber products, \$1 per year, or fraction thereof during which he engages in such activities.

(b) Computation of tax: Where a tax under subdivision (1) or (5) of subsection (a) is payable on July 1 of any year it shall be computed for 1 year; where any such tax is payable on any other day it shall be computed proportionately from the 1st day of the month in which the liability for the tax accrued to the following July 1.

(c) Liability in case of activities in more than one place: In the event that any person subject to a tax imposed by this section engages in any of the activities enumerated in subsection (a) of this section at more than one place, such person shall pay the tax with respect to each such place.

(d) Liability in case of more than one activity by same person at same time: Except as otherwise provided, whenever more than one of the activities enumerated in subsection (a) of this section is carried on by the same person at the same time, such person shall pay the tax for each such activity, according to the respective rates prescribed.

Sec. 3231. Registration.

(a) In general: Any person subject to the tax imposed by section 3230 shall, upon payment of such tax, register his name or style and his place or places of business with the collector of the district in which such place or places of business are located.

(b) Special requirements for millers: The Secretary shall not permit the registration of any person under this section as a person required to pay the tax imposed by section 3230 (a) (6), unless in the opinion of the Secretary such person (or if a corporation, each officer thereof) is a person of good moral character and unless in the opinion of the Secretary such person is a person of suitable financial standing, intends to engage in good faith in the business of manufacturing or producing fiber or fiber products from the plant *Cannabis sativa L.* on a commercial basis, and is not seeking registration under this section for the purpose of facilitating the unlawful diversion of marihuana. Any person who is registered under this section and has paid the tax imposed by section 3230 (a) (6) shall afford agents of the Bureau of Narcotics ready access at all times to any part of the premises of the mill or other premises of such person and the right to inspect any and all books, papers, records, or documents connected with the activities of such person in dealing in, manufacturing, and processing *Cannabis sativa L.* and fiber

or fiber products thereof, and the handling of marihuana. The Secretary may cancel or may refuse to renew, after notice and opportunity for hearing, the registration of any such person if he finds that such person has not complied or is not complying with the requirements of this subsection, or if he finds that grounds exist which would justify the refusal to permit the original registration of such person under this section.

Sec. 3232. Exemption from tax and registration.

(a) Employees: No employee of any person who has paid the special tax and registered, as required by sections 3230 and 3231, acting within the scope of his employment, shall be required to register and pay such special tax.

(b) Government and State officials:

(1) In general: An officer or employee of the United States, any State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or insular possession, or political subdivision, who, in the exercise of his official duties, engages in any of the activities enumerated in section 3230 shall not be required to register or pay the special tax, but his right to this exemption shall be evidenced in such manner as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.

(2) Cross reference:

For authority of the President to issue Executive orders providing for the registration and the imposition of special taxes upon persons in the Virgin Islands, see section 2603 (b).

Sec. 3233. Returns.

(a) Registrants: Any person who shall be registered under the provisions of section 3231 in any internal-revenue district shall, whenever required so to do by the collector of the district, render to the collector a true and correct statement or return, verified by affidavits, setting forth the quantity of marihuana received or harvested by him during such period immediately preceding the demand of the collector, not exceeding 3 months, as the said collector may fix and determine. If such person is not solely a producer, he shall set forth in such statement or return the names of the persons from whom said marihuana was received, the quantity in each instance received from such persons, and the date when received.

(b) Persons liable for tax.—

For general requirement as to records, statements, and returns in the case of persons liable for tax, see section 2594.

Sec. 3234. Unlawful acts in case of failure to register and pay special tax.

(a) Trafficking:

(1) Liability: It shall be unlawful for any person required to register and pay the special tax under the provisions of sections 3230 and 3231 to import, manufacture, produce, compound, sell, deal in, dispense, distribute, prescribe, administer, or give away marihuana without having so registered and paid such tax.

(2) Enforcement of liability: In any suit or proceeding to enforce the liability imposed by this section or sections 3230 and 3231, if proof is made that marihuana was at any time growing upon land under the control of the defendant, such proof shall be presumptive evidence that at such time the defendant was a producer and liable under this section as well as under sections 3230 and 3231.

(b) Transportation: It shall be unlawful for any person who shall not have paid the special tax and registered, as required by sections 3230 and 3231, to send, ship, carry, transport, or deliver any marihuana within any Territory, the District of Columbia, or any insular possession, or from any State, Territory, the District of Columbia, any insular possession of the United States, or the Canal Zone, into any other State, Territory, the District of Columbia, or insular possession of the United States: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall apply to any common carrier engaged in transport-

ing marihuana; or to any employee of any person who shall have registered and paid the special tax as required by sections 3230 and 3231 while acting within the scope of his employment; or to any person who shall deliver marihuana which has been prescribed or dispensed by a physician, dentist, veterinary surgeon, or other practitioner registered under section 3231, who has been employed to prescribe for the particular patient receiving such marihuana; or to any United States, State, county, municipal, District, Territorial, or insular officer or official acting within the scope of his official duties.

Sec. 3235. Penalties.

For penalties for violating or failing to comply with any of the provisions of this part, see section 2596.

Sec. 3236. List of special taxpayers.

Collectors are authorized to furnish, upon written request, to any person a certified copy of the names of any or all persons who may be listed in their respective collection districts as special taxpayers under section 3230, upon payment of a fee of \$1 for each 100 of such names or fraction thereof upon such copy so requested.

Sec. 3237. Other laws applicable.

All provisions of law (including penalties) applicable in respect of the taxes imposed by sections 2550 and 3220 shall, insofar as not inconsistent with this part, be applicable in respect of the taxes imposed by this part.

Sec. 3238. Definitions.

When used in this part and subchapter C of chapter 23.

(a) Person: The term "person" means an individual, a partnership, trust, association, company, or corporation and includes an officer or employee of a trust, association, company, or corporation, or a member or employee of a partnership, who, as such officer, employee, or member, is under a duty to perform any act in respect of which any violation of this part or subchapter C of chapter 23 occurs.

(b) Marihuana: The term "marihuana" means all parts of the plant *Cannabis sativa* L., whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds, or resin; but shall not include the mature stalks of such plant, fiber produced from such stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of such plant, any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination.

(c) Producer: The term "producer" means any person who (1) plants, cultivates, or in any way facilitates the natural growth of marihuana; or (2) harvests and transfers or makes use of marihuana.

(d) Transfer or transferred: The term "transfer" or "transferred" means any type of disposition resulting in a change of possession but shall not include a transfer to a common carrier for the purpose of transporting marihuana.

Sec. 3239. Cross reference.

For provisions authorizing seizure and confiscation of marihuana for persons violating this part, see section 2598 of chapter 23.

For provisions giving the Secretary authority to prescribe rules and regulations to enforce this part, see section 2599 of chapter 23.

For authority of the Secretary to delegate the powers conferred on him by this part to officers and employees of the Treasury Department, see section 2600 of chapter 23.

For the territorial extent of this part, see section 2602 of chapter 23.

For administration of the special taxes in Puerto Rico, see section 2603 (a) of chapter 23.

For burden of proof in the case of exemptions in this part, see section 2597 of chapter 23.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2348) was read the third time and passed.

#### REPORT ON PROGRAM FOR POSTWAR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on November 17, 1944, the late President Roosevelt asked the Office of Scientific Research and Development to make an investigation of our scientific achievements in this country. He asked several questions on which the office proceeded to conduct investigations and to make recommendations to Congress.

The results of the investigation and the answer to the President's letter have in the last hour been placed on Senators' desks. Last Thursday I introduced a bill to carry out the purposes of these recommendations in the field of scientific research and the development of our scientific personnel, not only for the war effort, but for our postwar welfare and prosperity.

I hope that all Senators will read this document. It is the result of many months of detailed study by the top scientists of the United States, and they make excellent recommendations to the Congress. They cover the field completely. As I have said, I recommend this report as excellent and important week-end reading.

Mr. BURTON. There are some copies of the report on the desks on the other side of the aisle, but not on this side.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if the Senator thought the Republicans could not be educated. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Not only do we think they could be but we think they ought to be.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a radio broadcast by Raymond Swing on Thursday, July 19 last, relating to this subject.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

One of our vanities as a democracy has been the belief that only in the freedom we enjoy can science flourish. The scientist who is not allowed full freedom of thought and self-expression, we have assumed, will not function. That this is a vanity is attested by the fact that we and the British have two official organizations at the moment combing the ruins of Nazi Germany for its scientific secrets. I think it is fair to say we are looting the German minds, for I see no record that we are sharing what we learn with the Russians or that the Russians are sharing anything of the sort with us. Nor am I sure that our finds are being entered on the reparations books. Apparently this is good parlor manners for allies at the end of a war. But that is not the point I want to register. It is that the German scientists under Hitler made valuable discoveries which we now have scientists by the scores scurrying up and down Germany trying to ferret out. According to the Wall Street Journal, there is an organization called CIOS, or Combined Intelligence Objectives Subcommittee, which works



under the Anglo American Chiefs of Staff and is doing a super-hush-hush job in learning about German secrets. A further organization under the Combined Chiefs of Staff is named TIIC, or the Technical and Industrial Intelligence Committee, which is out to find what working scientists in German industry know that we don't. As fast as we get this information it will be utilized to improve our own war production, and later on our peacetime production.

TIIC has already learned a great deal. It has, the report says, the richest booty in techniques for making liquid fuels, lubricants, aircraft, and synthetic rubber. We are now testing catalyst compositions we hadn't known for producing aviation gasoline. The Germans had eliminated one whole manufacturing step. TIIC has found how the Germans make the best substitute yet devised for butter from coal; also soap and frying fats.

Swarming through the Reich's factories and filling cabinets, says the report, are about 215 of our Nation's most brilliant technologists, from private business, universities, and Government bureaus. Another 110 will be sent to Europe before the end of the year. It has been found that the German scientists were far ahead of production and had discoveries on hand which the Germans had not had time to exploit. All these are now to be available to us and the British. And if this is all true and a democratic use is made of the knowledge gained, we as a people shall benefit from science as developed under the Nazis.

We know the Nazis developed the V bombs and had almost reached the stage of the rocketization of all their artillery. The next V-bomb type was to have had a range of 1,200 to 1,800 miles, and the one after that, already in design, was to have had a range of 3,600 miles. Rocketization of artillery has been less publicized. The Christian Science Monitor publishes correspondence about it from Frankfurt, saying that Hitler ordered the whole of German artillery to be rocketized by the end of 1944, which, fortunately, could not be brought about. A range of several hundred miles already was obtainable by a gun the Germans had actually developed. The gun looked like a pipe line of three to four hundred feet, and was lighter, cheaper, and more mobile than regular heavy cannon. It could be developed to fire 15,000 miles. Introduce and perfect radio controls, and the whole world would be completely unsafe. The war ended before our troops had to meet rocket artillery at its intensest, or before distance had been mastered in fact as it was in theory. But the promises of Hitler about new weapons were all too true.

I have yet to see an authentic appraisal of what the German scientists achieved, or a comparison of it with what scientists achieved in Britain and this country. We know little about our own science. Radar was our special triumph. It won the war of the Atlantic and made it possible to beat the Japanese Navy in the Pacific. The victory in Europe can be said to have been made possible by a single engineering feat—the artificial harbors for the invasion beach of Normandy. That isn't scientific discovery, but it is the product of creative scientific talent. Now we are to have the cream off the scientific milk of Germany, and, I add with all the gravity I can muster, we need it.

For science in this country—no matter what it has achieved—has been doomed to a season of sterility. And one of the most urgent questions before Congress and the people today is how to shorten that season of sterility. We haven't come to the season yet. We are headed for it. It will go down in the books for all time and all posterity that in this war the American democracy shoved its potential scientists into the armed forces, and thus killed off large num-

bers of them, and what is to the point today, it failed almost altogether to educate a 6 year supply of scientists. The result is that we shall be short about 150,000 scientific and technical students with bachelor's degrees, and 10 years from now we shall be short 17,000 men capable of doing original scientific work in chemistry, engineering, geology, mathematics, physics and the biological sciences.

These figures I take from the remarkable report to the President made yesterday by Vannevar Bush, Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, a report called Science, the Endless Frontier. Dr. Bush remarks: "Neither our allies, nor so far as I know our enemies, have done anything so radical as thus to suspend almost completely their educational activities in scientific pursuits during the war period." One may bitterly survey the consequences of our military policy. But it would be wrong to blame the military. Its business is to win the war, not to save democratic civilization. It is the business of Congress and the administration to save democratic civilization. And the greatest delinquency, probably, in our entire war policy has been our failure to think through the effect of our indiscriminate use of talented men on the future of our society, and not to keep our schools filled with selected women students to replace the men. It isn't only science that has been disregarded. The arts and humanities have suffered equally, and our civilization will suffer when we feel the dearth in leaders of all kinds.

But I misrepresent Dr. Bush's report, if I give the impression that he is wringing his hands. He brings a practical program which can be applied immediately. "The armed services," he writes, "should comb their records for men who, prior to, or during the war, have given evidence of talent for science, and make prompt arrangements consistent with current discharge plans, for ordering those who remain in uniform as soon as militarily possible to duty at institutions here and overseas where they can continue their scientific education." And he proposes the establishment of a Government agency which shall provide 24,000 undergraduate scholarships and 900 graduate fellowships in science. This would cost the Government \$30,000,000 when in full operation. "We can no longer count on ravaged Europe as a source of fundamental knowledge," warns Dr. Bush. "A nation which depends upon others for its new basic scientific knowledge will be slow in its industrial progress and weak in its competitive position in world trade, regardless of its mechanical skill."

A strong merit of Dr. Bush's program is its strong democratic basis. In the past, as he points out, higher education has been largely for those who could afford it. If those who could afford it were the only ones with the talent, that would not be a waste of education on those not deserving it, or neglect of talented students who cannot go to college because they are too poor. "There are talented individuals in every segment of society," says Dr. Bush, "but with few exceptions those without the means of buying higher education go without it. Here is a tremendous waste of the greatest resource of a nation—the intelligence of its citizens. If ability, and not the circumstances of family fortune, is made to determine who shall receive higher education in science, then we shall be assured of constantly improving quality at every level of scientific ability."

Dr. Bush feels it necessary to list the benefits of science. For one thing, it is imperative to keep it active for purposes of defense. "New manufacturing industries," he proceeds, "can be started, and many older industries greatly strengthened and expanded if we continue to study nature's laws and apply new knowledge to practical purposes. Great strides have been made in agriculture, such as control over insect enemies, better

fertilizers, disease-resisting plants. Advances in science mean more jobs, higher wages, more abundant crops, more leisure for recreation, for study, for learning how to live without deadening drudgery. Advances in science will bring higher standards of living, will lead to the prevention or cure of diseases, will promote conservation of our limited national resources, and will assure means of defense against aggression." It is almost pitiful that Dr. Bush, writing a report to the President of the United States, feels he must thus catalog the services of science. Once upon a time this country prided itself on being the pioneer in science, the great land of research, the civilization which knew best how to cherish and develop talent. But the report was written to be read by Congress where a bill has to be debated. It has been promptly introduced in the Senate today by Senator MAGNUSON.

It took a Theodore Roosevelt to stir this country to the conservation of its limited natural resources, and it needed a long fight for his policy to be adopted. Now Dr. Bush is appealing for the conservation of our limited and most essential human resources. One hopes it will not need as long a fight to have his belated and modest program adopted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will give this matter consideration upon its return after the summer recess.

#### REDEPLOYMENT AND TRANSPORTATION OF SERVICEMEN

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, earlier today the able senior Senator from Illinois discussed the question of transportation and the position taken by the Senate committee of which I have the honor of being chairman. In connection with that discussion, which I think was very helpful and productive of good, I want to read into the Record the press release issued by our committee on the subject of transportation. It is as follows:

The Subcommittee on Transportation, under the chairmanship of Senator FRANK P. BRIGGS (Democrat of Missouri) has concluded a series of executive hearings on the transportation crisis which has arisen as a result of the redeployment of troops to the Pacific war theaters.

The situation is already so acute that the committee has determined to hold open hearings in order that the public may be fully informed of the facts. Present indications are that civilian railroad service, even for essential requirements, will be severely curtailed for many months to come.

The committee's investigations to date reveal that there was little long range planning with respect to redeployment, particularly the redeployment of troops. Government agencies vitally interested in the entire question were generally not consulted and were apparently even in ignorance of some of the plans made by the Army.

Adequate planning and careful coordination by all of the Government agencies involved would have helped to cushion the shock of the job which the railroads must now perform. The task, however, is so tremendous that even at best, severe restrictions on transportation must be expected to continue. There are not enough Pullman cars in the entire country to provide Pullman transportation to every soldier whom the Army will move in the next 6 months. Moreover, there are not even enough of the best type of day coaches to carry out this assignment. However, all soldiers traveling by train for more than 48 hours will get Pullman space.

The committee will inquire into these considerations as well as about measures which may be taken to relieve congestion. An example of such measures would be adopting

cities in Georgia, Alabama, and the vicinity as the western terminus of southern trans-Atlantic air routes in place of Miami, which is now the terminus. This would involve very little additional flying, but would eliminate a long railroad haul through the entire State of Florida. Similarly, soldiers being returned by the northern route, who are bound for western and midwestern destinations, could be taken directly to Chicago from Newfoundland with very little additional air transport, thus eliminating a long haul from the present eastern terminals.

It should be pointed out that in addition to regular trains taken over for the exclusive use of the Army, the armed forces take about 35 percent of the Pullman reservations and actually use about 40 percent of the Pullman space over and above the Pullman cars which are taken for their exclusive use.

Freight shipments to the west coast will have to be increased to the fullest capacity of the lines. The western railroads have already been doing a remarkable job. However, they are handicapped by lack of manpower since about 300,000 experienced railroad men have been drafted, and new recruits are generally without experience. The committee has been advised that the increased ability of the railroads to carry freight to the Pacific coast will be in direct proportion to the number of trained men they can put to work.

Mr. President, our committee took this matter up because of the numerous articles which have appeared in the newspapers in recent weeks telling about our soldiers being transported in day coaches while prisoners of war were riding in the finest Pullmans. There were many other complaints, some of which were brought to the attention of our committee by Members of the Congress. Being a committee created by the Senate to investigate matters of this character, we felt it our duty to go into this subject. Therefore we did go into it.

Mr. President, we are aiming to do a better job through better coordination of the agencies of Government, the systems of transportation and, if necessary, the nations which are members of the United Nations. We admit they are all doing a good job, but a better job can be done with better coordination. The Army is doing a fine job of transportation, but we believe if the Army keeps all the agencies and all the systems of transportation better informed it, too, will be able to do an even better job.

Mr. President, this is a gigantic task. It not only involves bringing home from foreign theaters the men who are going to be demobilized and sent to their homes, but it may mean raising a tremendously large military personnel for active duty in the Pacific theater. It might involve as many as 10,000,000 men, a colossal undertaking which requires the highest type of coordination.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the United Nations should get together and see to it that every available ship, every available vehicle of transportation, is utilized first of all and in the highest priority by troops who are coming home and going to the Pacific, and this all before any work is done that may have any tinge of being postwar in character.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Mead investigating committee—and the Senator is also a member of the Military Affairs Committee—how many men are actually being discharged from the service? There was considerable discussion earlier today about transportation, about bringing the boys home and discharging them. I am in favor of that. But I find, after making investigation today, from what little information I was able to obtain that actually only about 350,000 men have been discharged, and that during that period we have inducted men into the service at the rate of nearly 90,000 a week. I should like to know what the present size of the Army is. Are not these men simply going through the country from one theater of war to another theater of war? Are we to have the public believe that we are discharging millions of soldiers? Or is it not a fact that we have discharged only about 350,000, and that we will have an Army larger than before?

Mr. MEAD. I should like to be able to answer the question directed to me by my able colleague from Nebraska, but our committee has constantly refrained from going into matters purely military, that may involve questions of strategy. We are concerned now, so far as this investigation is concerned, with the transportation problem.

I want to say as I conclude, Mr. President, that only a few days ago the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion addressed a letter to the Secretary of War in which he called for that better character of coordination between the agencies of Government which our committee hopes to attain. In the letter addressed to the Secretary of War the Director of War Mobilization and Reconversion points out the necessity for this improved coordination, and he indicates that every agency of Government involved in the question of transportation ought to know what every other agency of Government requires in the matter of transportation.

So, Mr. President, our committee, which has been created by the Senate to go into these over-all matters, problems pertaining to the war, problems which cut across the jurisdiction of a number of committees, problems which cut across the jurisdiction of a number of agencies, will continue our investigation, and on Monday next we will have open hearings, and we will at a later date submit a report to the Senate so the Senate may know the recommendations of the committee.

I conclude by saying that I believe that the discussion in the Senate has been very helpful, and, in my judgment, will prove to be beneficial to the work of our committee and to the work of the several agencies of Government.

#### QUIETING OF TITLE TO CERTAIN PRIVATE LAND IN LIVINGSTON PARISH, LA.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, yesterday the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys reported to the Senate a bill which is purely local in character. I refer to Senate bill 504, introduced by me. It is a bill to quiet title and possession

with respect to certain unconfirmed lands in my State. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 504) to quiet title and possession with respect to that certain unconfirmed and located private land claim known as claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13, in Cosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749, and being designated as section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg land district, Livingston Parish, La., on the official plat of said township.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Louisiana whether the bill is purely local in character?

Mr. ELLENDER. It is purely local in character. It was reported by the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, and there is a favorable report from the Department of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to that certain tract of land known as that located but unconfirmed private land claim of Daniel Boardman, C. No. 13 in Cosby and Skipwith's Report of 1820, certificate 749 (see: American State Papers, Gales and Seaton edition, vol. III, p. 465 and the following) and being the whole of section 44, township 7 south, range 3 east, Greensburg Land District, Livingston Parish, La., as shown on the official plat of said township, approved by R. W. Boyd, surveyor general, Louisiana, July 29, 1852, shall be, and the same is hereby, directed to be granted, released, and relinquished by the United States in fee simple to the owners of the equitable title thereto, and to their heirs and assigns forever, as fully and completely in every respect whatever, as could be done by patent issued therefor according to law.

SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this act shall in any manner abridge, divest, impair, injure, or prejudice any valid right, title, or interest of any person or persons in or to any portion or part of the lands mentioned in said first section, the true intent of this act being to relinquish and abandon, grant, give, and concede any and all right, interest, and estate, in law or equity, which the United States is or is supposed to be entitled to in said lands in favor of all persons, estates, firms, or corporations who would be the true and lawful owners of the same under the laws of Louisiana, including the laws of prescription, in the absence of the said interest and estate of the United States.

SEC. 3. The Department of the Interior shall cause a patent to issue for said land and such patent shall issue in the name of the original claimant, as aforesaid, and when issued, shall be held to be for the use and benefit of the true and lawful owners as provided in sections 1 and 2 of this act.

#### RELEASE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL TO PROVIDE MANPOWER IN THE BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, yesterday we had under consideration Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, Calendar 501,



being an effort to furlough and discharge between 30,000 and 40,000 soldiers to become coal miners. At that time I entered strenuous objection to the purpose of the concurrent resolution. Were the authors of the concurrent resolution present, I think I would make a motion to recommit the concurrent resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs. Because they are absent, I shall not do so.

To substantiate my objection of yesterday, I wish to have placed in the RECORD a letter written by the Acting Secretary of War, Robert Patterson, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, whose permission I have to offer it for the RECORD. A similar letter was sent to the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

July 21, 1945.

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: It has just come to my attention that Senate Concurrent Resolution 21, relating to the discharge of coal miners from the Army, was brought to the floor of the Senate yesterday, that action thereon was deferred, and that it may be brought up again today. This resolution provides for the immediate discharge of 10,000 experienced coal miners said to be eligible for discharge under the point system and for the furlough of an additional 20,000 such miners. The War Department did not have an opportunity to comment upon this resolution before the committee.

The War Department is opposed to this resolution. Passage of it would do serious damage to the present point or merit system of discharge and would prevent the prompt release of many men who have earned such release by long, arduous, and dangerous service.

The War Department recognizes coal mining as one of the important industries of the country. But the coal industry is not unique. The request for such discharge or furlough is merely one of many similar requests made by various industries. Fifty industrial and professional groups have demanded the release of men from the Army to meet urgent civilian needs. They include loggers, longshoremen, railroad workers, shipyard mechanics, textile workers, hard-rock metal miners, farmers, dairymen, and others. All offer appealing reasons. If we authorized the discharge or furlough of all those for whom requests have been received, we would have to release 1,000,000 men from the Army and would be forced to abandon our present merit discharge system.

The Army has established a discharge system—a merit system—which gives priority to those who have served longest, who have fought hardest, and who have children. It is based on the expressed belief of the enlisted men themselves that this is the fairest method of selection, and current polls show that more than four-fifths of those expressing opinions regard the system as fair and equitable.

In the careful sampling of soldier opinion, enlisted men in all parts of the world expressed strong opposition to selection of men for early release on the basis of civilian occupation.

The number of men we can release is fixed by the requirements of the war against Japan. If there is a reduction in this requirement, the lower troop figure is still a fixed one. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that for

every soldier who is released on any occupational ground, some soldier who would otherwise be eligible for release because of long, arduous, and dangerous service must remain in the service. This would mean refusing a discharge to a soldier who has had long and arduous service overseas, much of it in actual contact with the enemy—at Salerno or Anzio or on the Rhine. A release for coal mining of thousands of men who would not otherwise be eligible to leave the Army would in effect deny discharges to a comparable number who had earned them by dangerous duty in the combat zones. It would in many cases mean the earliest discharge for men who had served the shortest time. The last in would be the first out.

For these reasons and in order to give full effect to the merit system of discharge the War Department has consistently refused requests for other furloughs or discharges. The sole exception has been the 30-day furlough of 4,000 soldiers to work on the Nation's railroads and thereby help maintain the flow of traffic which is essential to the redeployment of our armed forces for the war against Japan. This military situation and its temporary remedy is, of course, not comparable to that of coal miners.

Let no one be misled by the plea that only a furlough is asked for as to some of these former coal miners. The representative of the Solid Fuels Administration has definitely stated that furloughed coal miners would not be returned to duty until such time as the Japanese are defeated. In other words, it is a discharge and not a furlough that is sought in the case of coal miners.

The statement in the resolution that the Army in the near past has furloughed coal miners to work in the copper mines is unfounded. Likewise, the statement that 10,000 coal miners serving in the United States are now eligible for discharge, and the statement that there are 20,000 additional coal miners serving within the United States, have no foundation in fact, so far as we know.

The War Department feels that the merit system is a promise to—in effect a contract with—our men who have borne the real hardships and made the real sacrifices of the war. We would break faith with our fighting men if we should defer their return to their homes in order to favor some industrial group.

In justice to the soldiers who have borne the heaviest burdens of this war, we ask that this measure be disapproved.

A similar letter is being sent to Senator McKELLAR.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,  
Acting Secretary of War.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I hope no effort will be made to obtain action on the concurrent resolution during the remaining days before the adjournment unless it is recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs, where full and complete information can be obtained, especially on the point of how discharges for any particular class of workers who may be needed would disrupt the point system of discharge which has been agreed upon, and would seriously disrupt the war effort against Japan.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I do not want the concurrent resolution recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs. I have agreed with the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs that there will be a hearing on Tuesday morning. If at that time the Committee on Military Affairs should withdraw its endorsement of the concurrent resolution, I should be willing to have it recommitted to the committee.

Otherwise, I should like to have it remain on the calendar, because at the conclusion of the meeting to which I have referred I should like to have an opportunity to discuss the measure on the floor, if that is agreeable to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator was absent when I began my remarks. At that time I stated that I would refrain from making a motion to recommit the concurrent resolution.

Mr. KILGORE. I thought the Senator had made such a motion.

Mr. GURNEY. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with regard to the subject under discussion, I have no doubt that the situation with regard to labor in the coal industry is fully as serious as has been represented by the Senator from West Virginia. However, I question somewhat the method proposed to be used in order to get miners discharged for the purpose of working in the coal mines.

Let me say that while the coal situation is undoubtedly desperate, the food situation is equally desperate. In this connection, yesterday I wrote a letter to Secretary Stimson, urging him, so far as possible, to release qualified men who might indicate a willingness to return to food production and the saving of the crops. I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of that letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

July 20, 1945.

HON. HENRY L. STIMSON,

The Secretary of War,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have just returned to Washington from a trip to New England and must say that I am quite depressed over conditions which I found prevailing in the farming areas. I understand that similar conditions exist in virtually all sections of our country. Food supplies are apparently becoming increasingly scarce, weather conditions have been generally bad and the farm labor situation the worst I have ever seen it.

As you know, northern New England and New York is an intensive dairy producing area. At present pasturage is good and a record supply of milk is being produced. We are given to understand, however, that grain for dairy feed will be very short this coming winter. I feel that many people have been lulled into a sense of false security by the fact that a record supply of milk is now being made, but, so far as I can see, the prospects for next winter are not good.

One saving factor in the whole situation is an excellent hay crop. If this could be harvested, it would go far toward carrying our farmers safely through next winter, and maintaining a badly needed milk production. However, very little has been harvested to date. Only a few days of good weather have been available and, as I have stated, the farm labor situation is very, very serious. Only a few of the men discharged from the armed services have returned to the farm. Almost none of the men laid off in war plants have returned to farm work. Migratory labor promised by the Government has not materialized. Unless our farmers can harvest their crops, and particularly the hay crop, within the next few weeks, I fear that the shortage of food will become far more acute than anyone now expects. For this reason, I hope that you

will give every consideration to releasing from the Army those men who are qualified for release by the Army formula and who express a willingness to help produce and save the food crop of this country.

The draft has now stripped our farms of all but a negligible number of young men of military age. While I know that many factors must be given consideration in the discharge of men from the armed services, yet I do feel that the seriousness of the situation does necessitate speeding the release of those qualified servicemen who express a desire to help improve the critical food situation which exists not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE D. AIKEN.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope that if the Committee on Military Affairs seriously intends to try to instruct the War Department as to the manner in which servicemen should be discharged, it will give full consideration to the needs of the farmers, who have never been so short of help as they are today, and who have not for years faced such unfavorable weather conditions as they now face. We must save the crops if it is at all possible to do so.

#### PUBLIC SERVICE OF HENRY MORGENTHAU, JR.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on Monday at 10:30 in the morning, in the Ways and Means Committee room of the New House Office Building, the new Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Fred M. Vinson, will take the oath of office and assume his duties as Secretary of the Treasury. That means that today is the last day—certainly the last weekday—on which the retiring Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., will serve in that capacity. I am not willing to have the day go by without saying a word by way of tribute to the public service of Henry Morgenthau in the capacity of Secretary of the Treasury.

He came to Washington with the Roosevelt administration. For many years he had been a neighbor in Dutchess County of the late President Roosevelt, and they were long-time personal friends. His distinguished father was an outstanding member of the diplomatic corps under the administration of Woodrow Wilson, and rendered eminent service to this country in a diplomatic capacity during World War I, as well as prior and subsequent thereto.

Henry Morgenthau, Jr., came to Washington as head of the Farm Loan Administration, which is now the Farm Credit Administration. Many persons who did not know that he is a real farmer and has spent most of his adult life in agricultural pursuits, including horticultural and other activities incident to farm life, wondered why the President appointed him head of the Farm Loan Administration.

On the death of Secretary Woodin, the President appointed Henry Morgenthau to be Secretary of the Treasury. With the exception of Albert Gallatin, I think Mr. Morgenthau has served as Secretary of the Treasury longer than any other man in the history of the United States. He has served in that capacity during a very tragic and historic era in the life of our Nation. He has administered that

office with singleness of purpose; he has administered it in a manner which I believe will accord to him in the verdict of history the distinguished honor of having administered it during a period when it was most difficult to administer it. He has done it in a way to meet with the approval of the American people.

In addition to the ordinary duties of the Secretary of the Treasury, he has been in charge of the Treasury during seven war loan campaigns, each of which was oversubscribed. I think the goal of the last war-bond drive was \$14,000,000,000. The reports which have come in thus far indicate that the American people have subscribed more than \$26,000,000,000 in the purchase of war bonds to support the war effort. That is an outstanding record, and it would be one to the credit of any Secretary of the Treasury of the United States.

No man can doubt or question the sincere patriotism of Henry Morgenthau. No one can question his devotion to and his belief in American institutions. While he is retiring after the next to the longest service in the history of the Treasury, I am sure I express the feelings of all Members of the Senate in wishing for him not only happiness and repose and contentment in his retirement, whatever may be his activities in the future—and he is still a comparatively young man—but that in whatever field his operations may lie in the future, we wish for him success and happiness; and we wish for him the inward consciousness, which I know he will possess, that he has done all that he was required or expected to do in furthering the war effort, in maintaining to the best of his ability the standards of efficiency and soundness in our fiscal policy. He retires from public life with the best wishes and the confidence and affection of all those who have labored with him in this tragic era of our history. I would not want the day to pass without saying at least that much in honor of a great American, a great administrator, and a great patriot.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I would deny all my impulses if I did not express in a brief word my respect and regard for Mr. Morgenthau. The Senator from Kentucky has called attention to the fact that he has served in the great office of Secretary of the Treasury longer than any other Secretary of the Treasury save one. I doubt whether in all our history any other Secretary of the Treasury has had to meet such gigantic, involved, and difficult problems of public financing as has Mr. Morgenthau during the years when he has served in Washington. The only periods in our history which could match in difficulty the late years were those immediately following our Revolutionary War, when the new Constitution was established and the problems of that day were met, and the days of the Civil War, when our whole financial structure was in despair and when every imaginable difficulty confronted those charged with the administration of public finance.

I think Mr. Morgenthau has served with extraordinary zeal, with the greatest fidelity and, I believe, with unusual capacity.

I extend to him, first of all, my great respect and my feeling of warm regard, and I wish for him every pleasure and every comfort which life may hold for him during the years which I hope and believe stretch before him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sure the retiring Secretary of the Treasury will appreciate the generous words of the Senator from Maine, as I myself do.

#### LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in a few minutes I shall make a motion that the Senate take a recess until Monday. The motion will be to recess until 12 o'clock on Monday, because we have been rather busy this week, and I imagine Senators have accumulated work in their offices.

Following Monday, and beginning on Tuesday, I hope the Senate will be willing to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. We shall take up at once the Charter which has been brought to us from San Francisco, and which has been recommended, endorsed, and reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

So far as I know, we have cleaned up all essential legislation necessary before taking the recess or adjournment provided for in the concurrent resolution sent over by the House of Representatives and today adopted by the Senate. We have done that in order that we might clear the decks for the one remaining duty left to us before we ourselves embark upon what I think is a well-deserved adjournment and vacation. That remaining duty is consideration of and action on the San Francisco Charter.

Until consideration of the Charter has been concluded, I hope no Senator will ask that we deviate from that course for the consideration of legislative matters. It is my hope and purpose that the Senate remain in executive session from day to day until the Charter or treaty has been acted upon by the Senate, and that immediately thereafter the Senate embark upon its adjournment. I ask the cooperation of Senators toward the accomplishment of that purpose.

In view of the magnitude of the legislation which has been enacted by this Congress up to date, and in which the Senate has participated in every possible cooperative way and with a unanimity which I think should commend itself to the country, when we have discharged that duty we may for a season return to our constituents with the consciousness that we are entitled in a modest way to their confidence and their commendation.

Mr. President, I do not know how many days the consideration of the treaty will require, but I express the hope that we shall be able to dispose of it by the end of the coming week. Whether we are able to accomplish that or not, the consideration of the treaty will not require much longer than a week.

We cannot adjourn under the concurrent resolution until the first day of August. If we dispose of the treaty by the end of the week, or by the first day of August, I, as well as the Senator from Maine, will be here and ready to accom-



plish the purpose of the concurrent resolution by moving an adjournment until the 8th day of October. During the adjournment I am sure that Senators will enjoy a much-deserved rest.

If there is nothing further—

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Within the wide memory of the majority leader, is it possible for him to state how many weeks Congress has been in recess since the present war started?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not charged my memory with that information. If the Senator has it in his possession I should like to have him put it into the RECORD at this point.

Mr. GURNEY. No; I do not have the information.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say that by the time we are ready for adjournment I will have the information and will be glad to put it into the RECORD.

Mr. GURNEY. I thank the Senator.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCARRAN in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the matters on the calendar.

#### TREATIES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read Executive D (79th Cong., 1st sess.).

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under the circumstances the treaties will have to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the treaties will go over.

#### REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas F. Britt to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate following today's session, the President pro tempore of the Senate be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, July 23, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 21 (legislative day of July 9), 1945:

##### REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Thomas F. Britt to be register of the land office at Phoenix, Ariz. Reappointment.

##### IN THE NAVY

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

To be assistant civil engineers in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, from the date stated opposite their respective names

Charles J. Merdinger, February 7, 1941.

John E. Smith, Jr., December 19, 1941.

Griswold L. Moeller, December 19, 1941.

##### POSTMASTERS

##### TENNESSEE

Robert H. Warren, Appleton.

Mary B. Rountree, Beech Bluff.

Mary F. Ray, Buchanan.

Aubrey L. Moore, Bumpus Mills.

Thomas N. Ladd, Carters Creek.

Edwin L. Smith, Cumberland Furnace.

Charles M. Storey, Dellrose.

Emma Corbitt, Denver.

Mary Zula Greene, Duff.

Audrey D. Denton, Evansville.

Tella O. Mangrum, Fairview.

Elizabeth Givens, Medon.

Katie M. Steele, Model.

Fred H. Osgatharp, Moss.

Allie E. Fambrough, Neptune.

Marchella F. Rhymer, Newcomb.

Eunice S. York, Nolensville.

J. Green Hawks, Ralston Station.

George P. Tucker, Sylvia.

Annie M. Edgemon, Ten Mile.

William W. Taylor, Trenton.

Cecilia S. England, Whites Creek.

Byron D. Norfleet, Woodlawn.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JULY 21, 1945

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal God, through whose mercies we are spared and by whose power we are sustained: On this day of adjournment we would set up our Ebenezer of thankfulness and offer unto Thee our doxology of praise. Hitherto

Thou hast blessed us, and we have found Thee faithful unto all Thy promises.

We are beseeching for our President, our Speaker, the Members of the Congress, and all who serve in the affairs of government, in whatever capacity, the benediction of Thy peace and the diadem of Thy praise, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

We commend and commit one another to the guiding and providing Spirit of our Heavenly Father, for whom there is no darkness and no distance, with whom there are no setting suns or ebbing tides, and from whom neither time nor space can ever separate us.

Now may the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit be with us all. May the Lord bless us and keep us; the Lord maketh His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace.

Hear us in the name of Him who taught us to pray—

*Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever and ever.*

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 169. An act to amend section 8 of the act entitled "An act to amend the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes," approved July 13, 1943;

H. R. 246. An act for the relief of L. S. Strickland;

H. R. 795. An act for the relief of the duly appointed receiver of North Jersey Utilization and Sewerage Disposal Plant, Inc., or to such other person or persons as are legally authorized to collect the assets thereof;

H. R. 838. An act for the relief of Herman Gelb;

H. R. 952. An act for the relief of the Morgan Creamery Co.;

H. R. 1245. An act for the relief of John F. Davis;

H. R. 1301. An act for the relief of Madeline Winter and Ethel Newton;

H. R. 1346. An act for the relief of Alaska D. Jennette;

H. R. 1486. An act for the relief of Sam D. Moak;

H. R. 1595. An act for the relief of the Borough of Beach Haven, Ocean County, N. J.;

H. R. 1856. An act for the relief of Southwestern Drug Co.;

H. R. 2226. An act for the relief of Hugh P. Gunnells and Mrs. Dezaree Gunnells;

H. R. 2285. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to grant and convey to Springfield Township, Montgomery County, Pa., certain lands of the United States in Springfield Township, Montgomery County,